A REPLY TO A CONFUTATION of ſome grounds for Infants Baptiſme.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS 1879 CITY OF WASHINGTON

AS ALSO,

Concerning the form of a Church,

put forth againſt mee by one

THOMAS LAMB.

Hereunto is addded,

A Diſcourſe of the Verity and Validity of Infants Baptiſme, wherein I endevour to clear it in it ſelf: As alſo in the Miniſtery adminiſtring it, and the manner of adminiſtration, by Sprinkling, and not Dipping; with ſundry other particulars handled herein.

By *George Philips* of *Watertown* in *New England*.

MATTH. 7.15.

Beware of falſe Prophets, which come unto you in Sheeps-cloathing.

A parvulo recens nato, uſque ad decrepitum ſenem, nullus prohibendus eſt a Baptiſmo, Auguſt. Enchirid. cap. 42.

Dic quæſo & omni me libera quæſtione, quare infantuli baptizentur? Orthodox: ut iis peccata in baptiſmate dimittantur, Hieron. adverſ. Pelagian. Dialog. ter.

LONDON,
Printed by *Matthew Simmons*, for *Henry Overton*, and are to be ſold at his Shop in Popes-head-Alley. 1645.

БЕБГА

To the Reader.

WHO is ſo ignorant, but ſeeth what Satans Maſter-peece, and greateſt work in the kingdome of Chriſt is at this day, *viz.* to divide and ſow Tares of diſcord between man and man? And truly whoſe heart bleeds not to behold the preſent diviſions, by ſword, by pen, in affection & in opinion, under which the land of peace lies now a bleeding? Among which diviſions, none more lamentable nor grievous to a tender ſpirit, then thoſe that are between perſons profeſſing the feare of God, eſpecially in thoſe times when all their ſtrength and ſpirits ſhould be wholly taken up againſt the common Adverſary, watching their deſtruction at their very doores; yet ſuch is the malice of Satan to ſet them eſpecially at a diſtance, and at variance, whom the pretious blood of Chriſt hath been ſhed to reconcile. And this hee doth eſpecially when he hath ſtarted a controverſie (according to the old obſervation) *In re Sacramentaria*, in matters of the Sacraments; and therefore it is no wonder if hee troubles the world, and divides the mindes of ſome piouſly affected about the baptiſme of Infants; although withall one would wonder in other reſpects, how any

godly men who have better things to minde, ſhould hold up the Buckler in defence of ſuch a ſtigmatized doctrine, by the pens of ſo many of Gods Worthies, from the Scriptures. If indeed there were any new light concerning it, that was never yet diſcovered to the world, this preſent age might have ſecond thoughts, and learn the more by others errours; but when in this controverſie men dig up onely the old Sepulchers, and heap up little more then the dried bones and ſculls of other mens examined, condemned and corrupted devices: this is very uncomfortable, and very unbeſeeming the ſpirit of a prudent and humble Chriſtian; who will never ſuffer himſelfe to be removed, much leſſe attempt the moving of others, from the ancient received opinion and practice of the moſt ſincerely godly in all ages, without mountains of arguments, and light as cleare as the Sunne from the holy Scriptures, to alter his mind, or make him to remove the ancient Land-markes; and therefore he that writ the life of Doctor *Whitaker*, prudently obſerves of him, that he was *Academiæ oraculum*, the Oracle of that Univerſity; and, *Mundi miraculum*, the miracle of the world in his time: becauſe, though hee was a man of ſuch eminent parts, yet he ever kept the ancient received Doctrine, & had nothing proper, nor did he *in veteri via novam ſemitam quærere*, he did not ſeek a new path in the old way, as almoſt all Divines of great parts doe uſe to doe, as from *Hierom* he obſerves.

The Authour therefore of this Reply, (in which wee wiſh he had a ſtronger Adverſary to honour,) well knowne in the gates of his people, and among the Churches of Chriſt in this Weſterne world, for his learning, godlineſſe, and peaceableneſſe of diſpoſition, cannot bee juſtly blamed as any Fire-

Fire-brand of contention in returning this Answer, it doth but defend the Walls and Trenches of the ancient received Truth; nor would he have made any resistance, had he not been assaulted on that ground where himself with Gods truth, have had just and quiet possession so long: Nor hath he published it to increase disunion; but for satisfaction of his conscience,

Firstly, who hath given him this occasion to reply; or if not of his, yet of some others godly and tender, who in simplicity have been, or may be suddenly taken in the snares of the Fowlers of these evill times. I remember it was *Luthers* prayer, seconded often by learned, holy, and aged *Paræus*, *A Doctore glorioso, & Pastore contentioso, & inutilibus quæstionibus, liberet Ecclesiam suam Dominus.* To start this controversie about Infants baptisme, I feare upon sad examination, will fall under the head of those *inutiles quæstiones*, especially in these unsetled and troublesome times; and though pretended to be a work of Reformation, yet will give as sad a blow to that which is firstly and principally to bee attended in it, ~~as almost any~~ opinion I know; and the end will speak as much: And therefore a sober strong defence of the baptism of Infants, may be very profitable & useful against an unprofitable questioning of it now; and the more, because it is much to be feared, that the doctrine of *Anabaptisme*, especially in this controversie concerning Infants, will gangrene farre, and leaven much; and that for these Reasons:

First, because there is not that expresse word, nor such manifest cleerenesse in such full and expresse sentences of the Scripture, as in many other practicall points: For the practice of this; there is sufficient Scripture to satisfy a sober humble mind that loves the truth

truth in ſincerity in this point; yet they that are contentious, and love ſcruples, and queſtions, (a diſeaſe *Paul* would have cured, 1 *Tim.* 1. 5, 6.) will be alway touching upon that ſtring, *viz.* Where is your commandement? I ſee not any expreſſe Scripture; Yes, that you may by juſt and ful deduction from the Scripture; and that is a good proof from Scripture; or elſe our Saviours proof of the reſurrection was bad, from *I am the God of Abraham, Iſaac, and Jacob*, which is not expreſly contained in theſe words, but deducted from them.

Secondly, (if conſcience and experience may ſpeak) there are but few Chriſtians that have taſted the ſweet and comfort of their baptiſme; and therefore are very apt to queſtion this ordinance, if they meet with a fit tempter to deceive them: For this is a certain and everlaſting truth, *viz.* that that truth which a man hath received without love to it, by ſome ſenſe of the ſweetneſſe of it, in times of temptation, he will quickly caſt off: A man will not care for that bread that doth not feed him, nor will keep on thoſe clothes in Winter time that do not warm him; nor love that truth which doth not refreſh him; and conſequently will be ready to cut down that barren baptiſme under whoſe covert he hath ſo long lived, but never taſted of the fruit of it, never felt the comfort of the ſhadow of it; and aſſuredly, what ever reaſons men pretend againſt baptizing of Infants, this is generally the root of thoſe evills; they never felt the benefit of it, they never received this truth in love; and for this cauſe God ſends ſtrong deluſions about it, 2 *Theſ.* 2. 10, 11. And it's *Calvins* obſervation, concerning the *Libertines* and *Anabaptiſts* in his time; the Lord, ſaith he, never ſuffered a wicked man to fall into a ſtrong deluſion,

sion, but because he did not love the truth at all; nor leaves a godly man in a delusion for a time, but because hee did not love the truth enough. Some have therefore thought the best way to stop the spreading of *Anabaptisme*, was for some holy and able men to leave the controversall part; and more plainly, cleerly and positively to set out the nature and use of baptisme, and what benefits a Christian may reap thereby, and how he may suck out the milk and honey from this Rock; and then hee that once tastes the good of it, beholds the infinite riches of Gods grace therein, will not be easily perswaded to cast away that, which he feels of such daily use and precious vertue to him.

Thirdly, in regard of the unsetlednesse and ungroundednesse of so many godly Christians; partly through the want of setled and able Ministers among them; partly through a careleſnesse of spirit, in taking truths upon trust of other mens judgements only, not labouring to be grounded in them themselves; and hence, when they are strongly assaulted by *Familists*, *Anabaptists*, *Antipsalmists*, &c. they fall down, heaps upon heaps, and most miserably wounded, because they want armour and weapons, strong grounds, and cleere principles from Scripture, to defend themselves; and therefore it was the ancient complaint of zealous *Gildas*, that the *Arrian* heresie, and other poisonfull opinions, like so many poisonfull Serpents, infected the ancient *Britains*, because they were a people alwayes desirous of novelties, and stablished in nothing; and therefore let the *Reader* make much of such books, and of this in speciall, whereby the judgement may be convinced, and the heart established in the blessed truth of Christ; try all things herein, and weigh them in the ballance of the Word; what thou findest to be of

weight,

weight, receive in love, and remember to take heed of rejecting, that, if some things herein should want some grains, and seem too light; do thus for the truths sake, and so imbrace this truth in these divided times for peace sake, that they that have one God, and one and the same Jesus, may have one faith, and one and the same heart, as in other, so in speciall in this point, and not set the whole house on fire, to roast their own Egs; and that this may be, let sober minded men attend but unto these generall rules.

1. First remember the blessed Apostles Golden rule of peace, *Phil.* 3. 8. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16. Let every Christian make it his chiefest studie, his greatest busnesse, to prize Jesus Christ, to be found in him, to know him, and the power of his death and resurrection, to presse toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus; here is work for you (saith *Paul*) sufficient to take up all your life-time, and thoughts all your life long; let us therefore (saith hee) *as many as be perfect* (i. that think our selves most perfect and exact Christians, knowing more then all others) *be thus minded*; and then, if in any thing you be otherwise minded, and differ one from another, God will reveal the truth unto you. Oh that God would give those that are most zealous against *Pædo-baptisme*, to consider of this rule: How usefull is it for many to trouble themselves and the churches with these conceits; who, if well catechized, would be found extremely ignorant and ungrounded in the most necessary matters about their union and spirituall communion with Jesus Christ? and if they were well busied in matters of that heavenly nature, they would have little desire to spend their time and thoughts about lesse weighty and more doubtfull points.

2. Second-

2. Secondly, labour for holineſſe of mind, and a mean eſteem of your gifts, parts, knowledge, wiſdome, &c. The Apoſtle doth beſeech the *Philippians*, if any conſolation in Chriſt, if any comfort of love, if any fellowſhip of the Spirit, that they would be like minded, *Phil.* 2. 1, 2. and the means to this he ſets down, *verſ.* 3. *In lowlineſſe of mind, let each man eſteem of others better then themſelves*; You that contend againſt *Paedo-baptiſme*, think thus, *viz.* that as you are to prize Chriſt, ſo every truth of Chriſt; and you are perſwaded in your conſciences, that you have herein the truth on your ſides, otherwiſe you would not ſtrive for it; and that though many, nay moſt godly men have been, and are otherwiſe minded; yet you think they are but men, and therefore may be deceived: I anſwer, 'tis very true, they are men, and I had thought you had been ſo too, and therefore may not you be deceived? Is not lowlineſſe of mind of uſe now? to think how fooliſh thou art, and apt to be deceived, and to eſteem of others (very godly) better then thy ſelf; didſt never ſee the folly of thine own counſels? hadſt never experience how blind thou haſt been many times, not able to ſee things before thy very feet? Did the Lord never acquaint thee with thy extreme ignorance and uncapableneſſe of ſpirituall myſteries even about ſuch as none queſtion or doubt of? and maiſt not thou be wofully deluded, and blinded about that thy opinion with ſo many (as much acquainted with God as thy ſelf) yet dare not but queſtion and do fully condemn? haſt not felt thy heart naturally diſliking truth, and imbracing errour, and through the hollowneſſe of it, returning many ecchoes to one falſe noiſe? Feare therefore thine own weakneſſe, deny thy own wiſdome, think meanly of thy ſelf, and this difference will ſoon ceaſe; Little threads may

be easily tied together; you can hardly do so with cables ends, they are too big to fasten: be little in thine own eyes, and thou wilt soon cease contending about these points.

3. Thirdly, observe the fruit of this opinion; for by the fruits (not of false teachers lives, for they are in sheeps clothing, but of their false doctrines) yee shall know them, *Mat.7.6.* First, it leads men to destroy the extent of Gods free grace in that everlasting covenant he hath made with *Abraham* and all his seed, *Jewes* and *Gentiles*, to be a God to him and his seed; and hence come those audacious cries of a carnall covenant God made with *Abraham*, and not Evangelicall, nor a covenant of grace; and is it nothing to destroy Gods grace? Is it not a crying sin, to refuse God to be thy God, and is it no sin to refuse his promise of being the God also of thy seed? which (but that I dispute not now) is as much Evangelicall as the first branch is; if the first branch be, but what followes after this? The next is, they condemn all the best reformed churches, forsake all Gods faithfull Ministers (this is that Satan chiefly aimes at) by whom happily they have been called and long edified, then they confusedly gather into private churches, set up and commend an unlearned Ministery; it may be they like of none at all, because they can edifie themselves best by promiscuous propheceies; and any that can preach or propheſie, (as every one they say in his measure can) hath commission also to baptize; I will mention no more, nor do I mention this to offend any, but to humble and put a holy feare before the Saints eyes; But when I consider of these and such like fruits, I cannot but cry out with *Calvin*, having published the opinions of *Servetus*, these they are, (saith hee) *Vae autem eorum stupori qui ad ejus-*

modi

modi portenta non exhorreſcunt. Let it be therefore the care of all the faithfull ones of Jeſus Chriſt, to ſtudie peace, and follow after it; contend againſt the common enemies of faith, but let it be more bitter then death, to contend one with another; nothing more lamentable, then for to ſee Chriſts ſheep ſcattered one from another; a ſad token of the Lords forſakiug a people, when they will not come and agree togethe under his wings. Moſt certaine it is, that abuſe of libertie for every man to thinke what hee pleaſeth, and ſpeak what hee liſt, for Chriſtians to contend and hang together like ropes of ſand; to make little other uſe of the light, breaking forth glorioufly in theſe latter dayes, then drunkards do of candles in the night, when they are fallen out, which ſerve only to ſhew them on whom and where to lay the greateſt blowes; theſe things cry to heaven for a renewed tyrannie of blaſted Prelacie, or of that which ſhall be worſe to this generation. When the ſtaffe of bonds was broken, *Zach.* 11. 14. the Lord immediately ſet over his people an idle Shepheard in the land, *verſ.* 16. which ſhould neither viſit thoſe that were cut off, nor ſeek the young, nor heale the broken, nor feed that which ſtood ſtill, but only eat the fat, and teare their clawes in pieces: the God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt therefore pitie his poore ſcattered flock, bring back them that are driven or drawn away, ſeek out them that are loſt, heal them that are broken, feed and ſtabliſh them that ſtand, deſtroy the enemies of his peoples peace, untill that kingdome come in all his peoples hearts, both from Eaſt to Weſt, in old *England* and new, which is righteouſneſſe, and peace, and joy in the

Holy Ghoſt; that when the floods of Gods diſpleaſure ſhall overwhelme the Chriſtian world for that univerſall deep corruption of their own wayes, the waters of effectuall baptiſme (being lockt up in the Arke of Gods eternall Covenant) may lift us up in peace.

Tho. Shepard.

The

The Authour to the Christian Reader.

IF it were in my choyce, I would not trouble you with reading any thing of mine, being privie to mine owne insufficiencie to doe any thing in this kind, that may bee worth your pains; yet seeing I cannot avoid it, being provoked by one who hath made himselfe my adversary without a cause, and especially in a matter of so great weight and consequence, wherein he goeth about to wrong the truth of God professed by us, I desire you would hold me excused in undertaking the justifying so pretious a truth of the Lord, and maintaining the cause by a reply unto his confutation of some grounds, wherewith I am satisfied in my conscience, about our practice in the case of baptizing of infants of beleevers. I know you will meet with some things of no great weight, I desire not that you should think better of any thing then it is; only my request is, that you would cover any weakness of mine in that kind, nor let it at all prejudice your esteem and approbation of that which is according to God, and deserves acknowledgement. Something you shall finde which may be profitable to an humble and tractable spirit. Concerning the question it self debated, this seems to be a great matter with many, that there is no expresse command for baptizing beleevers Infants; and nothing will stop their mouthes, but still they call for a commandment to be produced for practising hereof. To answer this; First, Mat. 28. 19. Go, make Disciples in all nations, baptizing them, &c. seems to want very little of an express commandment to baptize Infants of beleevers, because they are certainly a part of all nations, and that as opposed to one nation of the Iewes, from whom the Gospel and Church estate was taken and given to all nations, a part of which nation Infants were, and under the same state of Gods dispensation of his grace, and partakers of all the priviledges thereof. And this may be further

cleared:

cleared from Mat. 21. 33.--43. *where the Vineyard and King dom taken from the Jews and given to the Gentiles, are th Church estate and covenant. Now that infants were plants in that vineyard, subjects of that kingdom, as well as men of years; and so must it be now, in this vineyard must be young plants, as well as old, and Infants subjects in this kingdome as they were before. It is true that the text saith,* Make them disciples, *and then* baptize them; *and I fully beleeve, that none but a disciple may be baptized; but I am out of doubt, and doe not in the least question, but that an infant of a now beleeving parent, is a disciple as wel as the parent, which I have fully cleared, I hope, to any judicious readers judgement in the explanation of the arguments grounded upon these Scriptures,* I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed, &c. 1 Cor. 7. 14. *Secondly, let them press for a command in all things also, and doe nothing further then they have an express command for every thing else that they doe or will doe; and then I shall think they may shew forth more justice & upright dealing, then otherwise I can conceive. And let any man give me an express command of baptizing women, or admitting them to the Lords table, besides many other things of weighty consideration in our practise, that may upon the same ground be called into question. And let them in good earnest give an express command for a man that is no Prophet, nor son of a Prophet, to take upon himself the office of teaching the word of God, and administring the publick ordinances, Amos 7. 14. Ro. 10. 14. Thirdly, if there be no commandment nor example in the state of the new Testament for a person unbaptized to baptize any other; then it is unlawfull for an unbaptized person to baptize any other. But there is no command nor example in the state of the new Testament for an unbaptized person to baptize others.* Ergo. *And so baptisme can never be administred by any unto any. For concerning the instance of* I. Baptist, *it will not satisfie conscience in this cause, both because he had an immediate calling, nor was he under the state of the new Testament, his*

Mini-

Miniſtery being oppoſed to the Miniſtery of it by our Saviour, Lu.7.28. John *was the greateſt among the Prophets (in the ſtate of the old Teſtament) before Chriſt; yet the leaſt in the kingdom of heaven (in the ſtate of the New) after Chriſt, is greater then he. Nor can it ever be proved, that* John *was unbaptized. Laſt of all, this cannot be denied, that a juſt deduct from the Scripture is of equall force with an expreſſe command. But by juſt deduction from Scripture it may be proved, that beleevers infants may be baptized.* Ergo, *it is of equall force with a command. Now whether the Aſſumption be not evinced by the ſcope and iſſue of my arguments, I leave to all impartiall readers to judge. And let this be further well conſidered, whether the denying baptiſme of infants of beleevers, doth not tend to overthrow all Chriſtian religion, and throw down all able Miniſtery of the Word, and ſet up an unlearned Miniſtery, and caſt all Evangelical order into deſperate confuſion. Though I will not take upon me to determine, yet this is my apprehenſion, I am perſwaded that this miſtake here, hath forced many to fall upon ſuch ungrounded courſes, as themſelves cannot reſt in, let any man follow this principle cloſe, and ſee where it iſſueth. Some denying this, and yet under conviction of the neceſsity of the ordinance, they have ſought a new baptiſme to be conferred upon them by ſome formerly baptized when they were men of years. Others not able to make that good, take another way, & one baptizing himſelf, after baptizeth others. Another ſort not content herewith, maintain, that any one converted, and coming to the knowledge of Gods ways, may teach others, & converting them, may baptize thoſe whom he ſo converts, though unbaptized himſelf; alledging for this purpoſe,* Mat. 28.19. *which place will give no ground to ſuch an apprehenſion, becauſe all thoſe were officers choſen to whō that was ſpoken, and were all baptized themſelves, and not unbaptized, as they who alledge it muſt underſtand it, otherwiſe making no jot to their purpoſe. Some other perceiving all theſe inſufficient to ſettle conſcience, waving all, do give up all*

ſolemne

ſolemn and religious publike worſhip of God, and travell with expectation of ſome new revelation, and wait for ſome immediate raiſing up of ſome extraordinary officer to begin all anew. And laſt of all (not to go beyond mine own obſervation) there is a generation, who queſtioning all the former practices (as they juſtly may) fall flatly to deny all miniſtry, and the uſe of it; Baptiſme, the Lords Supper, &c. as but for a time, and not now required; ſpeaking contemptibly of the Miniſtry, as Sorcerers and Magitians, and of all the ordinances of the Goſpel, as ſhadowes, Idols, and not to be regarded, (horreſcens refero). *Now deare Chriſtian Reader, as you love Gods truth, and deſire the bleſſing of it upon your own ſouls; conſider if it doth not deeply concern you all, to tremble at the calling into queſtion ſuch a precious and comfortable truth as this of baptizing believers Infants is: The denying whereof puts men upon ſuch unwarrautable and unſatisfiing practices as theſe be. And let me intreat you in the bowels of Jeſus Chriſt, to labor for an humble heart, and to walk cloſely with the Lord, praying mightily and earneſtly to him for his grace and holy Spirit to keep you in theſe evill and dangerous dayes: For bleſſed is he that keepeth his garments, that men may not ſee his nakedneſs,* Rev. 16. *Acquaint your ſelves with the worth of baptiſme; ſtudy to enjoy the full fruit of it, that your hearts being eſtabliſhed with the power of Gods grace, you may walk worthy the ſacred Laver of regeneration, wherewith you are waſhed; And bringing up your children in the diſcipline and inſtruction of the Lord: you may make good this truth, that your Infants are the baptized Diſciples of the Lord Jeſus. If my weak endeavours may be bleſſed of God for any furtherance and help unto you herein, I ſhall expect no other recompence for my pains, but your thanks to God, and prayers for my ſelf. And ſo commending my labours and you all by my earneſt prayers unto Gods gracious bleſſing in Chriſt Jeſus your Lord and ours, I reſt*

A fellow-ſervant of all Gods Saints,

GEORGE PHILIPS.

A Reply to a Confutation of ſome *Grounds* for Infants Baptiſme, &c.

HAving met with a Book, entituled, *A Confutation of Infants Baptiſme*, or, an *Anſwer* to a Treatiſe written by *George Philips* of *Watertown* in *New-England*, in defence of Infants Baptiſme, &c. it put me into a kinde of wonderment, to ſee my name put forth in print, and as Author of a Treatiſe, who never writ any ſuch Treatiſe, nor ever deſired or intended the publication of any Diſcourſe upon that, or any other ſubject; being privie unto my own diſability to do any thing in that kind, that may be to the glory of God, or the edification of all into whoſe hands ſuch a Treatiſe muſt needs come; and therefore do really judge that hee hath not only wronged mee, but the truth, and all Gods people, and done contrary to juſt and Chriſtian dealing, in publiſhing ſuch a thing under my name, and making that common which ought firſt to have been cleered by private dealing; the rule being evident, that if any offend another privately, the offended ſhould firſt ſeek to gain the offender, in convincing him of his fault, betwixt themſelves, and thereby prevent further ſcandall: This I am confident of, that I never writ one word to him (being altogether unknown to me) nor to any other in *England* about this matter. Yet ſeeing I cannot deny my name, nor wholly diſclaime all that he hath put forth under it, howſoever hee came by it, I hope none will condemn me, if I ſhall endeavour (by Gods aſſiſtance) to juſtifie the cauſe, in returning an Anſwer unto his Confutation, but rather think that I am neceſſitated thereto, by this his proceeding, unleſſe I would give my ſelf up to the cenſure of all, as not having a good cauſe, or being not able to give any cleer grounds to maintain it. But before I proceed thereto, I think it fit to give an account how this buſineſſe hath been carried.

One *Nathaniel Biſcoe* coming from *England*, and ſitting down with us at *Watertown*, upon a time deſired ſome conference with me, and eſpecially about theſe two things: The Churches conſtitution, and Infants Baptiſme: I judging he did intend no more then he pretended (a private conference about thoſe particulars for further light, being not well reſolved on either ſide) yeelded to his requeſt, and in my chamber with him alone, agitated thoſe two points, both hearing what he could ſay, and anſwering unto every objection he made; and alſo propounded unto him ſome of thoſe grounds which in that Book are expreſt; divers hours wee ſpent in that diſcourſe, and how I carried my ſelf towards him, I leave to him to manifeſt, or to be revealed when all ſecrets ſhall be made known. The iſſue was, that he had nothing to ſay; only for his better conſideration, he deſired that I would pen down thoſe arguments that had paſſed betwixt us on my part; I willingly (not ſuſpecting ſuch an event) yeelded, and in a piece of paper ſent them unto him, expecting that he would have attended a further conference with mee about the matter; but having got my paper, and tranſcribed it, he communicated it to ſome that were contrary to my apprehenſion in theſe points, and either himſelf, or ſome other by his means, ſent them into *England*, whether to this confuter, or who elſe, I know not: but this I am certain, it hath been thus divulged, and not written with my own hand, nor ſubſcribed by my name, ſo far as I can remember. And concerning the Propoſitions themſelves, and arguments here expreſt, I cannot ſay that here is all I writ, or that I wrote all that is here (having not the writing I gave him, nor a copy thereof, that I can find with me) only ſo far as I ſhall queſtion any thing, I will give notice thereof, as I ſhall meet with it: And having premiſed thus much, I come to the Book, and therein (paſſing by the title page): Firſt, to the Epiſtle prefixed, and ſecondly, to the Diſcourſe it ſelf. Concerning the Epiſtle, I obſerve theſe things:

Firſt, the means of Gods glory and mans happineſſe.

Secondly, the order how theſe means are to be improved and diſpenſed.

Thirdly, the grounds of his writing this Book, with the concluſion.

Touching the firſt, the means of Gods glory and mans happineſſe, theſe things are noted: firſt, it is Religion: ſecondly, that mens care and ſtudy ſhould be, principally how they ſhould exerciſe them-

themſelves in Religion, that they may attain that end: Thirdly, that this Religion muſt be pure and true Religion, otherwiſe men may not only miſſe the right end, but effect a quite contrary: Fourthly, that this true Religion is only to be Gods appointment in his Word: Laſtly, that the Word ſets forth Chriſt the Mediator as principall, and all other ſubordinate unto him, for the attainment of the end, Gods glory in mens happineſſe: from all which in the generall, and according to that ſenſe, they ſeem to bear, I ſee no reaſon to diſſent. Nor from the intimation of Satan and his miniſters policy to corrupt true Religion, and counterfeit a falſe Religion, under pretence of the true, to couſen, cheat and deceive poor ſouls with chaffe inſtead of wheat, *&c.* It being a certain truth, as the Scriptures and experience of all ages, and of this wherein wee live, do too wofully manifeſt. And I wiſh him ſelf were none of the number, as heartily as I pray for my ſelf. From this Diſcourſe hee deduceth nine Concluſions, to which I can ſubſcribe, under theſe Conſiderations. To the firſt, taking Religion, and pleaſing of God in a ſtrict and peculiar ſenſe, otherwiſe I do not ſee a ground of difference between ſins and duties materially: To the ſecond and third, the bond of obedience lieth upon all men, who therefore are to be taught in the law, that they may become dead to the law through the law, and ſo glad to flie to Chriſt for righteouſneſſe and life: To the fourth, the word Commiſſion, added to the reſt, ſeemed to make all actions of Religion common to all (as to preach, baptize, *&c.*) or to reſtrain acts of Religion to them in office only.

To the ninth; If hee intend by theſe words, *no man ought to perform any act of Religion, unleſſe Chriſt be all in all in that action*, that therefore no man may or muſt pray, *&c.* be exhorted thereunto, *&c.* I agree not with him. And ſo I come to the ſecond thing in the Epiſtle: The order how this Religion is to be wrought in mens hearts, and this is ſet down thus: Firſt, preaching the *Goſpel*, to convert men from ſin to grace, and then to baptize men converted, profeſſing their Faith, and not before; by which (as the end of baptiſme) they may be diſtinguiſhed, as by a badge or livery to belong to the Church of Chriſt: To this in a word, I ſay thus much; that there is a diſtinction to be made, between a company to be converted, and to be conſtituted, and a Church now conſtituted; in a company to be converted and to be conſtituted, that which is ſaid is true, the *Goſpel* muſt firſt be preached, and by faith received and

profeſſed, and then they are to be ſealed, and not before; but in a Church now conſtituted, the like is not required, but the Churches are propagated by continuall ſucceſſion, till God cut them off. Thus was it with *Abraham* and his family, the *Goſpel* was preached to him and his, he and his believed and were circumciſed, and after they did not believe before they were circumciſed, but were propagated and continued a Church till Chriſts time; and ſo when the *Goſpel* was to be preached to the *Gentiles*, they were not to be baptized till they believed, but believing they were joyned to the Church, and then baptized, and that Church continued by ſucceſſion till God cut them off again. But becauſe this is the point in difference, I ſhall ſpare farther ſpeech, till I come to reply unto the anſwer in the Book: And touching the complaint is made again of Satan and his Miniſters, Policy and Malice, to ſet up a falſe religion; I joyn in it, only I dare not account that to be any part of humane religion or of Satan, the baptizing of Infants (and I hope I ſhall prove it) is no humane device for any thing wee cannot prove to be divine in the adminiſtrations in *England*, I ſuppoſe our former practice and preſent ſtate, doth fully acquit us from giving our allowance thereto; but I ſhall have occaſion to ſpeak ſomething likewiſe about this afterward. And in a word, concerning the occaſions of his writing this Treatiſe, he expreſſeth amongſt others, the miſerable witchery and deluſion of Satan, which he had ſpoken of before, and intends to wrap up my ſelf and all other Gods ſervants and Saints in old *England* and here in new, with all our way of religion and worſhip, wherein we deſire to glorifie the Lord; To all which, I ſhall ſpare to anſwer, leaving any that deſire ſatisfaction in the caſe as it concerns us here, or them there, to a Diſcourſe I have written about that matter, in juſtification of Infants baptiſme, with the calling of Miniſters here and there, and their adminſtrations; and leave him to the Lord, who ſhall judge us all; only I wiſh him to conſider his own words, that if it be without cauſe, that hee thus traduceth and powres out his diſtaſte againſt us, he hurts himſelf more then hee doth us, and will be found to kick againſt the pricks; and it may be he ſhall not find it ſo eaſie a matter to anſwer all that hee hath here at randome written, and in his Confutation put out againſt me, before that Judge, as he ſeems to be bold in troubling the world with it. And ſo paſſing the Epiſtle, I come to the Book it ſelf, wherein I ſhall endeavour (by Gods good help) to juſtifie what he takes upon him

him to confute, and follow him ſtep by ſtep accordingly, as he goeth along, letting paſſe his Preamble; only I can ſay, hee ſpeaks not truth, in ſaying a Writing written by *Georg. Phil.* came to his hand, and ſubſcribed by him as Paſtor of *Watertown*, when as I writ it not; and what I writ was not ſubſcribed by me at all, and therefore let him that ſent it, and himſelf take it betwixt them, and ſee whether they may not juſtly repent of ſo ſpeaking: But to proceed, hee ſets down ſome Propoſitions, which it ſeems, that Writing expreſſed; for the clearing of the Arguments:

To the firſt and ſecond, wherof hee ſaith nothing, and therefore according to the ſecond, yeelds, that though there be no expreſſe literall commands for Infants baptiſme in the Scriptures nor example, yet if by juſt conſequence from thence it can be proved and cleered, that is as ſufficient as if it were literally commanded.

To the third Propoſition, about the tender of happineſſe to man two wayes diſpenſed: Firſt, to the firſt *Adam*, and all man-kind by the law and works; the other to the ſecond *Adam*, and all the elect in him, which being one eternall covenant from the firſt promulgation for ever in ſubſtance, yet varied by divers circumſtances in a fourfold period manifeſted, firſt from *Adam* to *Abraham*, called the Promiſe; ſecondly, from *Abraham* to *Moſes* in a viſible outward covenant; thirdly, from *Moſes* to *Chriſt*, called the old Teſtament; the fourth from *Chriſt* to the end, called the new Teſtament. To this, I ſay, hee hath divers exceptions, and of ſuch weight in his apprehenſion, that he is not able to forbeare my perſon and calling, as that I am not worthy the name of a Paſtor, and it doth very ill agree to mee, as the doctrine delivered in this Propoſition doth declare, being not wholeſome food, but a barren wilderneſſe, or rather hurtfull, effecting nothing but noyſome diſeaſes, and tending to death. In anſwer whereunto, in a word, I freely acknowledge my ſelf not worthy the name of a Paſtor, and that it very ill agrees to mee, and many reaſons there are, which force me ſo to acknowledge, though the cenſure of this Confuter makes me not think ſo at all, nor the doctrine there delivered by me, which is good and wholeſome, whatſoever hee ſaith to the contrary, if that be wholeſome that is contained in Gods ſacred Scriptures, as I ſhall cleer by and by: But let all take notice of this, that for a man to leave his cauſe, and fall upon mens perſons or callings, it is an argument of a bad cauſe, or a corrupted heart, or both; for I ſuppoſe hee will

not

not challenge univerſall authority, and who made him a Judge over me? in regard of his own private, I confeſſe he hath liberty to judge of what I ſay, or any other; and if I had written to him, he might rightly have anſwered, nor ſhould I have taken it ill, if hee had written to me about them, I think I ſhould have taken it well; but the man will be a Judge over me, and that without as much as a word of intimation that I had offended him firſt, but hee ſaith hee muſt have leave to tell me ſo: As concerning his exceptions, they are ſo weak, and of no value, as he muſt give me leave to tell you all, that the name of a wiſe and reaſonable man doth not (or very ill) agree to him, and be your ſelves Judges: For, firſt, he put an *if*; If I limit reprobates from the tender of happineſſe, made to the ſecond *Adam*, and all the elect in him, hee conceives I erre, becauſe they could not then be ſaid to refuſe the call of God, *&c.* but if I did not ſo limit it, what then? will he confeſſe he did ill to blot the paper with ſuch needleſſe ſuppoſitions? Or that he wanted charity to think that I never read thoſe Scriptures by him alledged, and many others: as alſo that of *Heb.* 3. *&* 4. 2?

To the ſecond exception againſt the third period; when I ſaid that a vail of ſhadowes were drawn over the Covenant, he ſaith it was not a vail ſimply, but becauſe Chriſt contained under them was not underſtood by the *Jewes*, which reſted in the deed done. To which I anſwer, that I did not ſay a vail ſimply, but it was a vail, and ſo the Scriptures, *Col.* 2. 16. *Hebr.* 9. 1. 8, &c. *Ezr.* 10. 1. 2 *Cor.* 3. 13, &c. where the Apoſtle ſpeaks of a double vail, one upon *Moſes* face, ſignifying the obſcurity of the miniſterie, (which in the miniſtery of the new Teſtament is done away) another upon their hearts, which remaineth unto this day upon them, (and upon too many other) but that ſhall be taken away when they turn to the Lord; ſo that it was a vail, and a vail ſimply, ſo that he might well have ſpared thoſe two, and not ſaid hee had many, there remaining but two, which are not many.

To the third exception and fourth, whereas I ſaid that the Scriptures ſpeaking of the old Teſtament, of the aboliſhing of the old Teſtament, are to be underſtood of that diſpenſation from *Moſes* time to *Chriſts*, and the oppoſition made in the Scriptures between the old and new, is of thoſe two times, from *Moſes* to *Chriſt*, and from *Chriſt* afterwards, and not of the former; hee ſees no reaſon why I ſhould ſo conclude: I confeſſe, ſo great is our ſinfull nature,

we

we think that to be good reaſon that is not ſo, and judge not that reaſon that is: but I may ſee a reaſon why I ſo conclude, though he ſees it not; and if I thought he would ſee it, I ſhould ſet it down, but if he will not, yet ſome may, for their ſakes therefore, this is the reaſon (yea, more then reaſon) why I ſo conclude: Firſt, the Scriptures mention two, an old and new Teſtament: Secondly, the Scriptures expreſſe the old to be that from *Moſes* to *Chriſt*, and the new, that from *Chriſt* and after, as I hope any will ſee cleerly by viewing theſe places: *Exod.* 24. 4. 8. *Heb.* 9. 15. to 24. *Jer.* 31. 31, &c. *Heb.* 8. 6. 8. to the end, *Heb.* 12. 18. to the end, 2 *Cor.* 3. 16. &c. and the whole courſe of the Apoſtles diſpute in removing the Law, Tabernacle, Service, Prieſthood, &c. which hee calls the old, and eſtabliſhing Chriſt and the true Tabernacle, and limiting his whole diſcourſe to theſe two, cleers it to me beyond exception; and this is the reaſon grounded upon theſe Scriptures, and other conſiderations why I ſaid as I did. He further ſaith, that the two firſt periods are the old Teſtament, as well as that of *Moſes* time till Chriſt; and firſt, becauſe they offered ſacrifices till *Abraham*, and then they circumciſed till *Moſes*: and ſecondly, becauſe thoſe ſacrifices before *Moſes* time and circumciſion then uſed are aboliſhed by Chriſts coming. To which I anſwer, though they offered ſacrifices before *Abrahams* dayes, and they after *Abrahams* dayes circumciſed, yet before *Moſes* time, God manifeſted not his will in a teſtamentary diſpenſation, nor can we properly ſay that thoſe were aboliſhed by Chriſts coming, being removed before by *Moſes*, at leaſt altered by a new inſtitution; nor were the ſacrifices of *Melchiſedec*, nor his Prieſthood aboliſhed, which was before *Moſes*, as was *Aarons*, but unto *Melchiſedec* our Saviour ſucceeded: ſo that theſe exceptions might well have been ſpared, ſeeing the doctrine contained in the Propoſitions is ſound and wholeſome, and the contrary unſound, and hurtfull; yet before I go from this Propoſition, let mee commend this unto you all, that the reaſon why they would weaken this Propoſition, is becauſe they would maintain that opinion that the Covenant made with *Abraham* was a carnall covenant, and of the fleſh, applying all thoſe Scriptures that ſpeake by way of derogation hither, when as they are ſpoken of the old Teſtament, and not of this period, from *Abraham*, which was the everlaſting Covenant of God, continued with *Jewes*, and now to us *Gentiles*, and the ſame for ever; and ſo my Propoſition is not anſwred, nor refuted.

To

To the fourth, of childrens capacity to receive all grace neceſſary to union with Chriſt, and juſtification to life thereby, as well as men of yeers; hee yeeldeth, only denying it to be manifeſt to us, which; this or that; nor of Believers children more then Infidels.

I anſwer, I grant it, we cannot conclude it of this or that, but of all alike, yet otherwiſe of Believers children then of the Infants of Infidels; for as Infidell parents are without God in the world, ſo their children are alſo, and we have no ground to think an Infidell man or woman is elected of God, adopted, &c. and ſo wee can judge no better of their children, but as the faith of the parents profeſſed is a ſufficient ground to me, to think according to the rule, that he belongs to God: ſo Gods taking hold of a Believers childe to be his, as he doth, (and we ſhall ſhew it afterward) is a ſufficient ground to me to think a Believers child to be juſtified and ſanctified, which though I may be miſtaken, and my judgement in this caſe is not infallible, yet it is as much as I can have of any man of yeeres, of whoſe ſtate I cannot judge infallibly.

To the fifth, where I ſay Baptiſme is not the firſt grace, but a ſecond, being a ſeal of the righteouſneſſe of faith, as circumciſion of old, *Rom.* 4. 11. which muſt be preſuppoſed, or elſe baptiſme not to be adminiſtred; he anſwereth that it is well to be heeded of all, eſpecially thoſe that maintain Infants Baptiſme, having no ground to conclude that Infants have a firſt grace; *Rom.* 4. 11. will prove no ſuch thing, it will only prove circumciſion was in the nature of it a ſeal of the righteouſneſſe of faith, and did ſeal it to *Abraham* that had faith, but not to them that had no faith; nor was it a ground why wee ſhould preſuppoſe faith in all, upon whom it was adminiſtred, or why it was adminiſtred.

To this I reply (1.) Baptiſme is not the firſt grace, but ſomething precedes it, to which Baptiſme is added as a ſeal; and if children have not ſome former grace to which Baptiſme doth ſeal; then I cannot ſee that they are to be baptized. This former grace (though many other things might be expreſſed, yet having ſo plain a Scripture, I reſt in it) is this righteouſneſſe of faith, which what ground we have to conclude children have, I ſhall labour to cleer under theſe diſtinctions: Firſt, the righteouſneſſe of faith is to be conſidered, either as it is diſpenſed by God in an offer, or as it is received by them to whom it is offered: Secondly, in applying this offer, God makes ſome partakers of it before the ſeal is put to, as in *Abraham*, the men

of

of yeers in his houſe, and Proſelytes (at leaſt in our judgement) ſome he makes partakers of it at the time of ſealing, both concurring, ſome after, and ſome never at all. 3. That circumciſion was (not in the nature of it, but by inſtitution) and Baptiſme is the ſeal of this grace, and is to be attended, either on Gods part or ours: On Gods part, ſignifying and confirming, that hee will make good his offer; on our part, that wee believe this offer, and abide in it; And to apply all God offered *Abraham* the righteouſneſſe of faith he believed, God ſealed and *Abraham* both; again, God continued the diſpenſation of this offer to *Eſau* and *Jacob*; and ſo all Infants of the *Jewes* after was willing to beſtow it upon them: God ſets his ſeal to confirm he is willing; *Eſau* had not the rites before, nor was it conferred at that time, nor ever after, and ſo it was with moſt of the *Jewes*, as is cleer in them, in the wilderneſſe, who had it not before, nor at the time, nor ever after; for the Goſpell was preached unto them, but they believed it not, and ſo it profited nothing; yet they were circumciſed Infants, though they had no faith before, nor then, nor ever after: what was then the former grace that this ſeal was ſet to? nothing in them, but the offer of righteouſneſſe on Gods part, which he ſaid, and ſealed, he was willing to beſtow on them; ſo I conclude the like in Baptiſme. The ſeal now of the righteouſneſſe of faith, and that there is the ſame former grace in Infants now, that was in Infants then; namely, the continuance of the diſpenſation of Gods offer of righteouſneſſe with which their fathers at firſt cloſed, and were partakers of, and which was one ſpeciall ground, why thoſe Infants were circumciſed, and is now a ground of Infants baptizing; and though many then were not, and many now are not partakers of that grace offered and ſealed, yet that doth not make it no grace; but on Gods part offered and ſealed, it is the ſame without alteration, that it is to them who receive it; and the difference lieth only in the ſubjects: for I ſuppoſe no man will deny, but God offered unto *Iſmael* the righteouſneſſe of faith, and that he ſhall be puniſhed for refuſing of it; and ſo the reſt of the *Jewes* that ſleighted Gods grace ſo offered: nor will any affirm that *Simon Magus* and others had not the offer of righteouſneſſe made unto them, but they that refuſed ſhall ſurely periſh for it, as they, *Acts* 13.38. Further, it is not right which is ſaid of them, that circumciſion to them was a ſign only, and to this end adminiſtred, to diſtinguiſh them, and to intereſt them in thoſe Lawes and Ordi-

nance, *&c.* which were means to typifie and lead to Chriſt that was to come, wherein they were to be trained up: For though this were one end, yet not only, nor all; for as it was a ſign diſtinguiſhing, ſo it was a ſign of juſtification, and that God would thereby circumciſe their hearts; yea, it was a ſeal as well as a ſign, and did not only ſignifie, but confirm. And may I not ſay the ſame of Baptiſme? (*mutatis mutandis*) and for that end to be adminiſtred to Infants now, that they by this means may be diſtinguiſhed, and thereby intereſted in all the priviledges of Lawes and Ordinances, and Miniſters, *&c.* which are means to ſet forth Chriſt come, and to minde us of his obedience to the Father, and that they may be trained up therein; where I adde, that by Baptiſme, I mean that outward part of Baptiſme (by a lawfull Miniſter) with water, in the name of the Father, Son and holy Ghoſt, which is often ſeparated from the inward, in the party baptized, and conclude this to be true Baptiſme, elſe *Simon Magus*, and thoſe falſe brethren, *Gal.*2. were not baptized, (having not that inward) and if they had repented muſt have been baptized anew.

To this he anſwereth, that it is true, becauſe falſe brethren are brethren, though falſe, and they ſeem to be true, and make ſuch a ſhew by manifeſtation of themſelves, and therefore according to us are to be judged true, and therefore to be baptized, though they be falſe, yet their baptiſme is true baptiſme; but to adminiſter it to one no brother, nor giving any manifeſtation of ſuch an eſtate that is not commanded of God, and ſo a humane deviſe to baptize ſuch an one. I grant this laſt; but if hee mean Infants are no brethren, nor can give any manifeſtation thereof, and therefore God, hath not commanded them to be baptized, and therefore to baptize them is a humane invention, I diſſent wholly, and in a word reply, children are brethren; for if God be their father as wll as to men of yeers, then they are brethren as well as men of yeers, but God is their God, and calls them his children, *Ezek.*16.20,21. And though God hath not expreſsly ſaid, yee ſhall baptize Infants; yet if by good deduction from Gods Word, it may be made good, it is ſufficient to cleer it from being a humane invention; but of theſe afterward.

Now I come to the ſixt Propoſition, as more was required of *Abraham*, and of men of yeers (*viz.* faith) before circumciſion, then of *Iſaac* and other Infants ſucceſſively circumciſed, ſo now no more

is,

is required of men of yeeres, (*viz.* faith) that they may be baptized, then of Infants of baptized perſons.

To this he anſwereth, that he grants more was in *Abraham* then in *Iſaac*, when circumciſed, but not more required of the one then of the other, without which he might not be circumciſed, and therefore concludeth, that all the males of *Abrahams* family were circumciſed, whether they had faith or no faith, nor was any condition pre-required: and ſo Proſelytes, that all males were to be circumciſed before they might eat the Paſſeover, but nothing required of them before circumciſion, *Exod.* 12. 49. nor was there any miniſteriall and teaching office ordained to circumciſe himſelf and all his males, and thereby become a proſelyte, without any other condition.

But now in the new Teſtament, a teaching Miniſtery muſt precede the parties baptizing, *Matth.* 28. 19. and faith in the Word taught, *Acts* 8. 26. & 10. 47. From whence he gathereth a double difference: firſt, then was required no Miniſter, nor faith to go before circumciſion: ſecondly, even in the conſtitution of the viſible Church, which then was conſtituted by naturall generation of *Abrahams* naturall ſeed, but now is conſtituted by ſpirituall regeneration of *Abrahams* ſpirituall ſeed.

To all which I reply: Firſt, if circumciſion was the ſeal of the righteouſneſſe of faith, then more was required of *Abraham* then of *Iſaac*, for *Iſaac* could not actually believe, and if *Abraham* had not actually believed before, he had not been circumciſed, which was the ſeal of that faith he had before hee was circumciſed, *Rom.* 4.

Secondly, concerning *Abrahams* family, that they were all to be circumciſed, and all the men of yeers alſo, without any condition prerequired, whether they had faith or no faith, I might paſſe it by, becauſe hee ſaith, it is but probable, though far more probable, yet in a word, is it ſo much as probable? had *Abrahams* males no faith, at leaſt in outward ſhew and manifeſtation, ſo that *Abraham* judged they had? 2. Doth not God give teſtimony that *Abraham* taught his houſe to feare him, and keepe his commandements? 3. And I conclude it very probable, that they profeſſed ſubjection to the ſame God, and his Word with *Abraham*, and were not Atheiſts, or worſhippers of a ſtrange God, which would ill beſeem *Abrahams* family and faith. To conclude, this is unſound to ſay, faith was not required of the grown males, and yet all circumciſed with

the ſeal of the righteouſneſſe of faith which they had not.

Thirdly, touching the proſelytes, that nothing was required of them before circumciſion, is taken for granted, without the leaſt proof, and contrary unto the Scriptures, which ſhew before they were accepted of God into the liberties of his Houſe, they were to take hold of his Covenant, joyn themſelves to God, and the people of *Abraham*, to feare the Lord, and to love him, &c. 1 *King.* 8. 41. *Ruth* 1. 16. *Iſa.* 56. 3, &c. Beſides, as before, they ſhould receive circumciſion, not as a ſeal of the righteouſneſſe of faith, which were a great abuſe: and hereunto I might adde the teſtimony of *Jewiſh* Writers, who record divers things to be done before they could be circumciſed, as *Ainſworth* relateth upon *Gen.* 9. 4. *Exod.* 12. 48, 49. and other places: the difference made therfore in this reſpect is void, nor is that exception of teaching Miniſters now prerequired, but not then, of any value; the Propoſition ſpeaking of more required then of men of yeers, then of Infans.

Touching the other difference he ſeems to make in the Churches conſtitution, then of *Abrahams* carnall ſeed, but now of *Abrahams* ſpirituall ſeed; I conceive it very unſound: For,

Firſt, were there not many proſelytes in the Chnrches then? and that of the conſtitution of it? were they *Abrahams* naturall ſeed by naturall generation, and all the males of his houſe, which amounted to the number of three hundred and eighteen trained men born in his houſe beſides others?

Secondly, the Churches conſtitution then conſiſted not of them as *Abrahams* ſeed in the fleſh, but in being the people of God by covenant, and thereby a peculiar people, a royall prieſthood, though this ſtate was continued by naturall generation from *Abrahams* dayes till Chriſt. The *Jewes* indeed pleaſed themſelves with the fleſhly prerogative; but our Saviour condemneth them, *John* 8. and the Apoſtle cleareth this point fully, *Rom.* 9. 1. to 9. & Chap. 10. 2, 3, &c. 11. 1. to 10. wherein the Apoſtle ſhewes plainly, the reaſon why they were not ſpirituall as others were, and they ſhould have been, becauſe a ſpirit of ſlumber fell upon them; ſo that the Churches conſtitution then conſiſted of many proſelytes, and all *Jewes*, not as carnall or a naturall generation of *Abraham* in the fleſh, but as a ſpirituall ſeed of *Abraham*, by following the ſteps of *Abraham*, in regard of Gods intention, offer and diſpenſations; but with many of them God was not well pleaſed, becauſe they were not ſpirituall

as.

as hee would have had them; and now the Churches conſtitution is of the like ſpirituall ſeed, though many be carnall, the Church then and now conſiſting of elect and reprobates, the elect only obtaining, and the reſt being hardened; and let mee ask him now in his own words as he doth me in his firſt exception to my third Propoſition, How can God blame them for refuſing his call, *&c.* were they not *Abrahams* ſeed in the fleſh? And is not this their true conſtitution, according to his apprehenſion? One thing more hee obſerveth, and that is a contradiction betwixt the fifth and the ſixth Propoſition, which he cannot but take notice of: The contradiction is this, that in the fift I ſhould ſay, faith, and the firſt grace muſt be preſuppoſed, or elſe Baptiſme not to be adminiſtred; and in the ſixth, that in a man of yeeres faith is to be required, and muſt be, that he may be baptized, but not the ſame of Infants: and framing a ſolution, which hee conceives I might make, *viz.* that grace may be in Infants, though not knowne; but in men of yeers, who are able to manifeſt what is in them, ſuch manifeſtation is to be required from them, without which, they are not to be baptized, and concludeth this doth not reconcile, but an apparent contradiction remaineth: To which I adde this ſhort reply:

Firſt, that I ſaid not, faith, or a firſt grace, but a firſt grace is to be preſuppoſed; nor did I mean it of faith, for they are not capable of actuall faith, though they may have habituall, which cannot be diſcerned; and I conceive that wee muſt look upon ſome known grace, from which we may judge (though not infallibly) that baptiſme doth belong unto them.

Secondly, therefore (as in my reply to his fifth Propoſition) grace is either fœderall, or covenanting grace, or of the things contained in the covenant: fœderall grace is that whereby God out of his free love doth take a people, and make them his, without any deſerts of their own, that were not his, *Deu.* 4.34.37.7. *Ezek.* 16.2, *&c.* And Infants were partakers of this grace, as well as men of yeers. Grace freely given is either generall to all in covenant (as the offer of all ſpirituall good contained in the Covenant, which hee is willing to make them partakers of; nor doth their refuſall derogate from the grace of God on his part offered unto them) or proper to ſome, and that either common to many, or particular to ſome; namely, the elect, as all grace accompanying and compleating ſalvation, *Heb.* 6. 4. 9. God in all preventing the creature, in beginning

ginning with them, and going before them, without which they neither firſt, nor laſt, would ſeek after, or receive any thing in the leaſt of all: Now then, to apply this, by firſt grace, I do, and did mean fœderall grace, and the diſpenſation of the offer of the benefits in the Covenant; and to this grace he ſealeth, and thereby confirmeth, that hee is willing to make all good unto them all on his part, and if they be not partakers of it, it will prove their own fault and ſin; and thus the contradiction was but imagined, and not really in my expreſſions. And then hee cometh to my arguments, whereby I prove, that Infants now are to be baptized: The firſt whereof is taken from the oneneſſe of the covenant, from *Abraham* to this day, and lieth thus; If the covenant made with *Abraham*, and continued to the *Jewes*, and ſince to the *Chriſtians*, be one and the ſame, then as Infants were in the covenant then, and received the ſeal of it, circumciſion, ſo are Infants now in the covenant, and muſt receive the ſeal thereof, baptiſme; but the firſt is true, therefore the ſecond. To this he anſwereth by denying the Antecedent, that the covenant is one and the ſame; and to cleer the grounds of his deniall, hee undertakes to ſhew, concerning the covenant of *Abraham*, 1. What it was not. 2. What it was. 3. That we have no ſuch covenant ſince Chriſts coming concerning our ſeed. In ſhewing what it is not, hee lieth down three things:

Firſt, that God did never promiſe to ſave any of *Abrahams* ſeed for *Abrahams* ſake.

Secondly, nor yet for his fathers ſake. I know none that ſay ſo, and therefore this might have been ſpared; yet *Iſhmael* was partaker of the ſame bleſſing, becauſe he was *Abrahams* ſeed, *Gen.*17. 20. and 21. 13. And many times the *Iſrælites* fared the better for their fathers ſake; nor yet was *Abraham* or his faith any efficient, or meritoriouſly a cauſe thereof, but Gods free grace alone.

Thirdly, hee ſaith, that God did never promiſe to give faith to all *Abrahams* poſterity in the fleſh, and ſets down two reaſons hereof: 1. Becauſe then God ſhould lie, becauſe he did not that he promiſed, but it's impoſſible for God to lie. 2. Becauſe it is a contradiction, to ſay that God had promiſed to work in them that he required of them, and yet blame them for not profiting in reſpect of the means vouchſafed them: To which I reply; firſt, what is the meaning of the promiſe, *Deut.*30. 6. and *Ezek.* 11.19. and the like? doth not God promiſe here that hee would give them faith? and

what

what is the meaning of that threatening, *Gen.* 17. 14. where God denounceth cutting off all ſuch as did not circumciſe themſelves for breaking his covenant? doth it not hold out their deſpiſing and neglecting the righteouſneſſe of faith, which God thereby ſealed his promiſe of making them partakers thereof? And for the firſt reaſon, that God ſhould then be a lier, I ſee no force in it; for did not God promiſe to bring them into *Canaan*, yet not one of them came in, being ſhut out by unbeliefe, *Heb.* 3. 7. *Jer.* 18. 9. At what inſtant I ſhall ſpeak to any (which is by promiſes) to build, and plant, and yet to repent of the good wherewith hee had ſaid, hee would benefit them, I hope no man will ſay God is a lier, nor in threatening *Nineveh* to deſtroy it in forty dayes, yet ſpared it, was he a deceiver? To ſay no more, the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 3. 1. *&c.* and 9. 5. cleereth that Gods faithfulneſſe in promiſing them all good, was not blemiſhed on his part promiſing, though they came ſhort by unbeliefe, nor is there any contradiction in Gods promiſing to work faith in them, and yet blame them for not profiting, for he was willing to work it in them, but they reſiſted his holy Spirit in the Miniſtery, *Act.* 7. 5. only this I deſire all to conſider, whether in denying God promiſed to work faith in them, and yet blaming them for not profiting, he doth not intend they had power of themſelves to do what he commanded, without any concourſe of his in the work, but only perſwaſion, the words ſeem to conclude of much, and others do ſtiffly maintain the ſame, with whom he conſents in denying Infants baptiſme. Next he proceeds to ſhew what this covenant made with *Abraham* was, and he ſaith that it was Gods command of circumciſion upon *Abrahams* poſterity in the fleſh, whereby hee did ſeparate, conſecrate, and diſtinguiſh them to be by his favour poſſeſſed of the land of *Canaan*, and divers priviledges therein, which he particularly deſcribeth, and thus hee ſaith hee declareth, what it is.

I reply, firſt, he ſhutteth out *Abraham*, *Iſaac*, *Jacob*, and all his poſterity, many hundred thouſands, that never were poſſeſſed of the land of *Canaan* nor any of thoſe priviledges mentioned, they being not brought into the land, nor any of thoſe priviledges inſtituted or revealed, till four hundred yeers after this covenant made with *Abraham*, and what was Gods covenant with all theſe, all the time, or was it diſanulled as ſoon as it was made?

Secondly, hee ſeems to confound the covenant and circumciſion the ſign of it, as if there were no other covenant, but circumciſion

in

in the fleſh, God calls it indeed his covenant, but it's ſacramentally, the ſigne for the thing ſignified; for the Lambe is called the Lords Paſſeover, which was but the ſigne of it: ſo the bread and the wine are called the body and blood of Chriſt, being but the ſign of the Teſtament and of communion of his body and blood; ſo likewiſe the Lord himſelf, *Gen.* 17. 11. calls circumciſion the token, and the ſigne of the covenant betwixt him and them, and ſo the Apoſtle calleth it, *Rom.* 4. 11. *Circumciſion is a ſign and a ſeal*, &c.

Thirdly, the covenant was, that God would ſend his Son in the fleſh, and by his righteouſneſſe, (called the righteouſneſſe of faith) juſtifie all that would believe it, and receive him and his righteouſneſſe. This God preached to *Abraham*, hee believed, and injoyed Chriſt, and righteouſneſſe by him, and was juſtified thereby, *Rom.* 4. *Gal.* 3. 8. God preached this to all the poſterity of *Abraham* in the wilderneſſe, in the land of *Canaan*, till Chriſt came, all that believed and received Gods offer, were juſtified, as *Abraham*; all that did not believe, and were not juſtified, ſhould have been juſtified if they had believed, and were not juſtified, becauſe they believed not the Goſpel being preached unto them, and God promiſing hee would juſtifie them if they would believe, but it profited them not, becauſe it was not mixed with faith in thoſe that heard it, *Rom.* 9. 31. *Gal.* 3. 18. *Heb.* 3, &c. 4. 2. *Joh.* 1. 11, 12. And all theſe particulars which hee expreſſeth, were added by *Moſes* from God, to typifie and lead them to Chriſt which was to come; ſo that it was Chriſt and his righteouſneſſe which was held out unto them, and offered, and that properly and principally, God intending not the ſacrifices and the reſt for themſelves, but Chriſt by them, and circumciſion firſt and laſt was the ſign and ſeal hereof on Gods part adminiſtred, whereby he ſignified unto them, and confirmed his gracious readineſſe to juſtifie them, and ſanctifie them in and through his Son; ſo that all that hee ſaith in this caſe, though in ſome ſenſe it is true, yet it is but a part of the truth; and ſo he cometh to the third concluſion, which is this: That wee have now no ſuch covenant ſince Chriſts coming in the fleſh, concerning a fleſhly ſeed, as was that of *Abraham*. This he laboureth to prove by a pretty large diſcourſe, the ſumme whereof is gathered into theſe Propoſitions.

Firſt, that the fleſhly ſeed of *Abraham* was a type of Chriſt to come; which he proveth from *Gal.* 3. 16, 19. where hee ſaith, by *ſeed* there, is meant Chriſt, and therefore ſpoken in the ſingular number,

number, *Seed*, as of one, that is, Chriſt; and not *Seeds*, as to many, and ſhewes that the word *Seed* may bee interpreted of Chriſt two wayes, myſtically for true beleevers in Chriſt, 1 *Cor.* 12.12. or typically, or ceremonially for the fleſhly ſeed not beleeving, as the Lamb, &c. were types of Chriſt.

To this I reply, Firſt, the fleſhly ſeed was not a type of Chriſt; what was inſtituted by God are to be acknowledged: but God never inſtituted the naturall and fleſhly ſeed of *Abraham* to bee a type of Chriſt to come: Some of that naturall ſeed did typifie Chriſt, as *Aaron* and his ſonnes, but not as naturall ſeed: Not as naturall ſeed, but as Officers in their offices and adminiſtrations. But neither they nor the reſt were ceremonially Chriſt, and types of him, it is a doctrine of mans invention, *Gal.* 3. 16. will prove no ſuch thing. Firſt, by ſeed we are to underſtand Chriſt individually, and not collectively: for by him alone individually, we have the bleſſings of God upon us, & it cannot be communicated unto myſticall Chriſt, and to make the members of Chriſt ſharers in the worke of bleſſing of us. Secondly, interpreting the ſeed to be Chriſt, either myſtically or typically, he excludes all true beleevers that were myſtically Chriſt (beleeving now being no otherwiſe but myſtically) from being a type of Chriſt, though *Abrahams* fleſhly ſeed. Thirdly, in ſaying the not beleeving poſterity of *Abraham* by fleſhly relation, was a type of Chriſt, he concludes it of *Eſau*, and all after him, in all their idolatries, witchcrafts, &c. to bee types of Chriſt throughout their whole ſtate till he came, which cannot be true of them before *Moſes*, till when there was no inſtitution of types of Chriſt, nor yet fleſhly nor honourably propounded.

The ſecond Propoſition is; This fleſhly ſeed, not beleeving, were in the Covenant, and a true Church, till Chriſts time and death; the abſence of the thing typified, neceſſarily requiring the preſence of the type.

Reply: Firſt, as I ſaid before, they were not a type of Chriſt, and therefore in that reſpect were not neceſſarily to be in Covenant, and a Church, till Chriſt came.

Secondly, If the fleſhly ſeed not beleeving, as ſuch were in the Covenant, and of the true Church, then *Abraham*, *Iſaac*, and *Jacob*, with all beleeving *Jews* were not in the ſame Covenant, and parts of the ſame Church, being not homogeneall parts, *i.* of the ſame, but of a diverſe kinde.

Thirdly, If the fleshly seed were typically Christ, and a true Church, then either those many hundreds in *Abrahams* family, *Isaacs* servants, and all *Proselytes*, after being circumcised, were not of the Church, or else should typifie Christ with the *Jewes*, and yet not *Abrahams* fleshly seed, so as the conclusion of *Abrahams* fleshly seed, being ceremonially Christ, is not right.

The third Proposition, That when Christ came and died, then they were no longer in the Covenant, nor a Church, but were broken off by unbelefe; and he makes this to be the reason (in answer to a second objection he makes why then?) the presence of the thing typified necessarily requiring the absence of the type.

Reply. This is no reason of their breaking off, they being no types of Christ; and the Apostle gives a certaine and a sure reason, *Rom.* 11. 11. & 19. &c. That salvation might come to the Gentiles, for to provoke the *Jews* to jealousie, &c. 2. Himself confesseth they were broken off by unbelefe, which necessarily implyes, that either they had not been cut off, if they had beleeved, and so were not types, or else if types, they should have been cut off, though they had beleeved.

Two Objections he raises:

First, Were they not under unbelefe before? and he answereth yes, no doubt.

Secondly, Why were they not broken off before? and why then? He answereth, because till Christ came they were in the Covenant, and a true Church typically by being circumcised, and observing the ceremonies of the Law. This is his answer.

I reply to both: First, They were in unbelefe before.

Secondly, most of them were broken off many hundred yeares before; as the ten Tribes in *Hezekiahs* dayes; *And God said, Lo-ammi, no people,* Hos. 1. 6. 8. *And Lo-ruhamah, no mercy.* I will no more have mercy upon them, but will utterly take them away; But I will have mercy upon the house of *Judah*: these ceased before Christ was come, and therefore are not a type, and so that no reason of their continuance.

But thirdly, The Scriptures give us a true reason (besides the former, *Rom.* 11.) why any of them continued till Christ came, and were not cut off before.

First, Because a remnant of them were to be saved, *Isa.* 1. 9. *Mat.* 24. 22.

Second-

Secondly, Becauſe Chriſt was to come of them according to the fleſh, and borne under the Law, *Gal.* 4. which he could not have been, if the Church eſtate had been diſanulled.

Thirdly, Becauſe they were to be rejected for caſting off Chriſt, *Zach.* 11. 10. to 15. & *Mat.* 21. 33. to the end, and 22. 1. At laſt he comes to his inference from all this diſcourſe, and concludeth the Covenant then and now is not the ſame; that was typicall in the fleſhly ſeed; and this of ſpirituall ſeed, and not typicall. To this I have replyed enough. Secondly, The ſtanding of them in that Church and Covenant, was by Circumciſion, and obſerving the rites of the Law; the ſtanding in this Covenant and Church is by faith and Baptiſme, and ſo upon different grounds.

I reply, Firſt, Circumciſion and obſerving of Rites being not the Covenant, but additions to the Covenant, and profeſſion of Faith; and Baptiſme alſo being not the Covenant, but additions, the Covenant may be the ſame, though the circumſtances differ: As the covenant made with *Abraham* till *Moſes*, and after to *Moſes* and the people, though to the latter were many additions, which were not in the former. Secondly, their ſtanding then, and our ſtanding now, is the ſame in ſubſtance (though much differing in circumſtances, viz. faith in Gods covenant; this is cleare, *Rom.* 11. 20. *they were cut off by unbeliefe, thou ſtandeſt by faith: if they continue not in unbeliefe, they ſhall be ingraffed again, v.* 23. We ſtand by faith, and ſo ſhould they have done if they had beleeved; and ſhall ſtand again when they ſhall beleeve. They were cut off for unbeleefe, and we ſhall be cut off for unbeleefe, if we give way to it: their falling and ours from Gods covenant and the Church eſtate, our ſtanding and theirs in the covenant and the Church-eſtate, is not upon different, but the ſame grounds. Thirdly, if the covenant under Chriſt be the ſame with that before Chriſt; then by the ſame right *Abraham* and his poſterity poſſeſſed the Church eſtate then and circumciſion, by the ſame right they might poſſeſſe the Church eſtate and Baptiſme now: But they could not poſſeſſe the Church eſtate & Baptiſme now, by the ſame right they poſſeſſed it. *Ergo.* I anſwer: they might, and that right was and is partly the grace of God offered, and partly their acceptance of that grace by faith working by love, though I might deny the conſequence, for that the covenant may be the ſame, and yet in ſome reſpect the right to be a member, in the one and in the other, might not be the ſame: But I have ſaid

enough before to cleare my Argument, and to make it good (notwithſtanding any thing in his anſwer againſt it) In his further proceeding in this Argnment, he granteth two things; Firſt, the covenant of God makes a Church then and now, a Church being nothing elſe but a people in covenant with God: and that as the covenant whereby a Church is made, differs; ſo the Church differs which is made by that Covenant, but the covenant then and the covenant now differs, therefore the Church differs: for the covenant which made them a Church, was Gods taking them (being circumciſed) to participate of all thoſe outward meanes which leads to Chriſt who was to come. That covenant which makes a Church now, is Gods admitting men to be baptized, making profeſſion of faith in Chriſt.

I reply in one word, I conſent that the Church then and now is made by a covenant. Secondly, I ſay, that circumciſion was not, baptiſme is not, the covenant, but ſignes and ſeals of the covenant, circumciſion then, baptiſme now. Thirdly, that the covenant then was, God would bee their God, juſtifying and ſanctifying them, through his Sonne whom he would ſend, if they would beleeve in him, and the ſame is the covenant now. Fourthly, the ſigne and the ſeale of it then was circumciſion, whereby God confirmed hee would circumciſe their hearts in his Sonne, by cutting away their ſinnes, in juſtifying and ſanctifying; the ſigne and ſeale of it now, is waſhing with water, &c. whereby God confirmes he will waſh away their guilt and ſtain of ſinne. Fifthly, the people then that were of years, did reſtipulate and make profeſſion of faith in Chriſt before circumciſed: And let any one ſhew me any one of *Abrahams* family, or one Proſelyte ever after, that was admitted into the Church eſtate without ſome reſtipulation (which is neceſſary in the nature of a covenant) and ſubjection to God & his righteouſnes, & ſo circumciſed without it. In a word then, as the covenant differs, the Church made by it differs; if the covenant differ eſſentially, then the Church differs eſſentially: but if the covenant differ but circumſtantially, then the Church differs circumſtantially, and not eſſentially. And ſo much is cleare, as I ſaid, unto which alſo himſelfe conſenteth in the next paſſage, granting it, as that Chriſt is, and ever was the Mediator and meanes of ſalvation, both before and ſince Chriſts coming, diſpenſed by the covenant of God, Chriſt being called the *Covenant*, *Iſai.* 42.6. *In whom alſo the promiſes are Yea & Amen*,

Amen, 2 *Cor.* 11. 18. It is true that he ſaith, that the outward meanes of making Chriſt known, doth depend differently upon his being yet to come, and upon his being come, the one being more dark and carnall, the other more plain and ſpirituall; and therefore the participation of theſe means doe make the ſtate of the participants to differ; but this difference is not in regard of the thing it ſelfe, but in regard of the manner of the thing, more darke, and more cleare, doe not change the thing, or make it diverſe, but onely circumſtantially, the ſubſtance is the ſame, the circumſtances differ. And thus much all his eight differences following, which he ſets forth to be between thoſe two ſtates, agree to alſo, they being not ſubſtantiall, but accidentall differences; yet ſo as they are not to be diſtinctly limited to one time in reſpect of the ſubſtance, and things themſelves, and the effects thereof: for all that he ſaith belongs to the new Teſtament, were communicated unto many of them under the Old, (as *Moſes*, *Aaron*, and all the elect of God) and none of them are made good to many in the New. But on the contrary, all that is ſpoken by him of the Old, may bee verified of men in the New, as experience witneſſeth, & the Scriptures affirm, *Gal.* 4. 29. The fault why all did not enjoy all theſe priviledges in the new Teſtament (diſpenſed under ſhadowes in the Old) being in themſelves, 2 *Cor.* 3. 13. 14. *Heb.* 3. 7. 8. 22. 4. 2. & 8. 8. and many now deprive themſelves of theſe priviledges, *Heb.* 4. 1. and attaine to no more then they in the Old, to eſtabliſh their owne righteouſneſſe onely, *Rom.* 10. 3. And therefore as none are to be admitted to the priviledges of the new Teſtament, or Goſpel now, but ſuch as are ſutable, though many prove otherwiſe. So none ought to have been admitted, nor were, in the Old Teſtament, (the ſame Goſpel preached unto them, and the new Teſtament ſhadowed under the old) to enjoy the priviledges of the Old, ſhadowing the priviledges of the New, but ſuch as were ſutable, even ſuch as are required in the New, though few of them proved ſuch, with this difference, they were to beleeve in Chriſt to come, to whom the Law and ſhadowes directed them; we are to beleeve in Chriſt already come, to whom the Ordinances doe direct us. And therefore what he further repeateth, (having ſaid the ſame all before) that whoſoever circumciſed themſelves, and their Males, and obſerved the Rites of the Law, they and their children (though Proſelytes) were the ſeed (& fleſhly ſeed too, for ſo he ſaith all this time) and in that

covenant,

covenant, and of that Church. But now onely ſuch as beleeve in Chriſt, and be thereby regenerated, are the ſeed, and in this covenant, and of the Church, might well have been ſpared, and have been anſwered before; yet ſeeing hee addeth ſix other reaſons to prove this latter (clearly proving as he ſaith) I ſhall bee willing to follow him.

And he ſaith, Firſt, beleevers regenerate onely, are in this Covenant, and of this Church, becauſe none of the naturall ſeed of *Abraham* are in this Covenant by vertue of naturall relation, though they remained in the Jewiſh Churches till Chriſts death. But their being in the Churches by naturall relation, then ceaſed as the Church ceaſed: I reply, Firſt, I have ſhewed that their ſtanding in that Covenant and Church, was not by fleſhly relation, but by ſpirituall, who were counted for the ſeed, *Rom.* 9. 8. 2^{dly}, Thoſe few that were added to the Goſpel Church, were not cut off as the reſt, but remained naturall branches ſtill in their owne Olive tree, and what naturall relation they had, they put not off; and when the reſt be added, the Apoſtle ſaith, the naturall branches ſhall bee ingraffed into their own ſtock: *For if the root be holy, the branches will be ſo too*, *Rom.* 11. 16, 17. 24. 3^{dly}, The Scriptures by him quoted, prove not the thing he alledgeth them for, *Acts* 10. 28. *Rom.* 9. 8. *Gal.* 3. 7, 9, 28, 29. & 4. 28.

His ſecond Reaſon: The *Gentiles* have no naturall relation to become his ſeed by, and therefore their infants cannot become the ſeed of *Abraham*, by being the ſeed of a beleever, but muſt beleeve themſelves, otherwiſe they cannot be partakers in the Covenant made with *Abraham*.

Reply. Firſt, there needs no ſuch relation naturall, nor were the *Jewes* (as naturall ſeed onely without faith) counted for the ſeed, *Rom.* 9. 8. Secondly, the *Gentiles* Proſelytes need not that naturall relation before to be in the covenant then, but were ingraffed into the body by faith, and therby their Infants: Thirdly, all now are not children of promiſe, but many alwayes are deceivers, and deceived, as many then, but not all; only this may be noted, that he yeeldeth that Believers now are partakers of the covenant of *Abraham*, and therefore that then and now is the ſame. And yet in the next and his third Reaſon, hee denies the covenant under Chriſt to be the ſame with that which was made with *Abraham*, becauſe the three thouſand converts, *Acts* 2. when they were baptized, did not bap-

tize

tize their Infants; this he ſaith is plain, *Acts* 2.41. and 8. 12. where it is, they that gladly received the *Word* were baptized, they and they only, which the Infants could not do.

Reply. In the old Teſtament, they that ſubmitted themſelves to the *Jewiſh* covenant, and would take their God to be theirs, were circumciſed, but Infants could not do that, yet they were circumciſed: Secondly, it is not ſaid they were baptized, and then it is not a perfect relation.

Reply. It followeth not, for all is not written that was done, they might be baptized, though it is not ſaid they were: For, were not Chriſts Apoſtles baptized? yet it is not written where, when, or who baptized them; it is no argument to ſay it was not done, becauſe it is not ſet down, but take it for granted, their Infants were not baptized then (which yet I will not grant, for ſome conſiderations I ſhall afterward ſet down in another place) doth this difference make that the covenant with *Abraham* and now is not the ſame? It is not the ſame in this reſpect, as all can be concluded, which is but a circumſtantiall difference.

The fourth Reaſon followeth, if *Paul* and others, writing to the viſible Churches, calls them Saints, faithfull Brethren, the Sons of God by adoption; *Rom.* 16, *&c.* and the Prophets (notwithſtanding they were led by the ſame Spirit) were wont to ſpeake otherwiſe of the viſible Church of the *Jewes* (as *Iſa.* 1.16. *Jer.* 1.2. *Ezek.* 3. 4. 4.12. & *Chap.* 16. 48. 51.) then naturall Infants were not in the covenant and of the Churches which the Apoſtles wrote unto, as they were in that covenant and of that Church the Prophets ſpake to: But *Paul* calls them Saints, and the Prophets the other *ſinners*; yea, *grievous ſinners*, and bids them *waſh themſelves*, &c. therefore naturall Infants were not in the Churches which the Apoſtle wrote unto, as they were in the *Jewes*.

Reply. I deny the conſequence in the Reaſon, as no way following, and the proofe of it as invalid: For as the Apoſtles do call the Churches Saints, *&c.* and the Prophets the *Jewes* ſinners in the places alledged; yet in other places, the Scriptures call thoſe ſinners Saints, Believers, Brethren adopted, *&c.* as in many places may be made evident; one or two may be enough: *Exod.* 19. 6. *A kingdome of Prieſts, a holy nation:* Deut. 33. 2, 3. *Pſal.* 22. 22. and 122. 8. *Rom.* 9. 3, 4. &c. And the Apoſtle, 2 *Theſ.* 2. calls them, *ſinners, carnall*, bids them *repent*, &c. to whom they wrote unto, as Saints: as

Galat.

Galat. Corinth. where were many groſſe things and ſinfully amiſſe, and moſt of the Epiſtles to the ſeven Churches, *Rev.* 2. & 3. Therefore there is no difference in thoſe Churches the Apoſtles wrote to, and that the Prophets ſpake to: and naturall Infants may be in the covenant, and of the Churches now, as they were before Chriſt, notwithſtanding. The fifth argument is the ſame with the firſt and ſecond, and therefore was then anſwered. The ſixth is taken from *Hebr.* 9. 8. where, from *Jer.* 31. the Apoſtle ſaith, *Behold, I will make a new covenant with the houſe of Judah, not like the covenant I made with your fathers, when I brought them out of the land of Egypt*, &c. where he notes, that the principall difference is in the ſubjects of the covenant: and let it be noted, that therefore it is not in the covenant it ſelf: in his proceeding, hee notes two differences; the firſt in the writing of the Law, which in the former ſtate was in a table of ſtone, not in their hearts, as without which they might not be the houſe of *Iſrael*; in the latter the law is written in their hearts.

Reply. Firſt, that this difference falls not in the time from *Abraham* to *Moſes*, as is cleer; for *Jeremiah* expreſſeth the time of their coming out of *Egypt*, and then that time began, whence the difference between that ſtate and this muſt ariſe; nor was the Law written before that time in tables of ſtone, and therefore either *Abraham*, and all thoſe following, to *Moſes*, had no Law at all, or it was written in their hearts; and indeed ſo it was, as well as it is now written in any of our hearts; but it is not written in all now, but only in ſuch as belong to Gods election, and ſo it was then; and therefore there is no difference betwixt that period, and this under Chriſt in the writing of the Law, nor in the ſubjects.

Secondly, the promiſe that God made to *Abraham* continued to all till *Moſes* time, and then was not aboliſhed, but continued ſtill to them, till Chriſt, as is evident, the Goſpell being preached to them in the wilderneſſe, *Heb.* 3. and to them in *Canaan*, Pſal. 95. the Goſpel and the Promiſe are taken for the ſame, *Gal.* 3. 8. 18. and ſince contimued to the *Gentile* Churches; and this promiſe is the covenant which is one in all times: Again, this is to be attended, that the Apoſtle ſpeaks not of the Covenant, but of the Teſtament, as is cleer by his whole diſcourſe, in the 8. and 9. Chapt. where he ſpeaks of one and the ſame thing in all, and it is of a Teſtament; and therefore *Jeremiah* ſpeaks of a Teſtament alſo: And therefore, though it be commonly tranſlated covenant, yet it ſhould be teſtament, at leaſt

leaſt covenant ſhould be underſtood teſtament. This teſtament in both places is twofold: the firſt from their coming out of *Egypt*, till Chriſt; the ſecond from Chriſt ever after: the firſt is called the old, and is antiquated or done away: the ſecond, called the new, is eſtabliſhed and remains. Nor are the times of the old and new Teſtament ſo to be attended in the differences, as if they under that had not the Law written in their hearts many of them, and all ſhould, (it being their ſin that it was not) or that theſe under the new Teſtament had every one of them the Law written in their hearts, many of them alwayes being deſtitute of the grace of God through their own default; ſo that the difference made by him is none at all; all the elect then having the law written in their hearts as well as in tables of ſtone, and none but the elect having it now written in their hearts, the reprobate having it then and now written but in tables of ſtone, for the Goſpel aboliſheth not the Law, and ten words, but eſtabliſheth it rather, *Rom.* 3. laſt.

The other difference he makes is from the effects of the Law then and now; in the former many of them were deſtitute of the knowledge of God: At the firſt, Infants circumciſed the eighth day, and therefore were to learn God in Chriſt afterward coming to yeers; but in the latter, all do know God from the leaſt to the greateſt, have the Law written in their hearts, poſſeſſe remiſſion of ſin; in ſo much, that it is a great ſhame for the Church of *Corinth*, that any of them ſhould be deſtitute of the knowledge of God: 1 *Cor.* 15.34. which could not be, if Infants were the ſubjects of this covenant and Church; therefore the covenant ſince Chriſt is not the ſame with that before Chriſt.

Reply. Firſt, he grants that ſome then had the knowledge of God, though many had it not; but why had they it not? Did hee not give them his Spirit to write it in their hearts? (which now writeth it in whoſe hearts it is written) if hee knew it not, let him reade *Nehem.* 9. 20. *Iſa.* 63. 10. *Acts* 7. 51. And to ſay all know God now, is contrary to experience, and Scriptures, and that in one of the firſt and eminent Churches, as his quotation ſheweth, 1 *Cor.* 15.

Secondly, God promiſeth then and now, to write this Law in mens hearts, offereth himſelf to do it by his Spirit, giveth all means neceſſary thereto then and now; but they did not all then, they do not all now know God, becauſe they reſiſt his Spirit in the means. There were then falſe Prophets, there are now falſe teachers, who

then led away, and now ſeduce many; but all the elect then and ſince obtained, though the reſt were juſtly hardened.

Thirdly, it is a great ſhame, that any in the Church of *Corinth*, or any elſe, under the new Teſtament, know not God; and ſo it was before, and they were alwayes blamed for it, which therefore they might, and ought to have had, elſe why blamed? Or were they blamed becauſe Infants were then in the Church, and knew not God? Were they not blamed for their own want of knowledge, though their Infants were uncapable? And may not wee now be blamed if they know not God? becauſe Infants be in the Church, as he concludes? The covenant therefore with *Abraham*, and after till Chriſt, and now ſince, is the ſame in ſubſtance, though it differ much in circumſtances; it being the ſame Law there written in ſtone, and now in fleſh, which was written in many mens hearts then as now it is; but not in all mens hearts now no more then before, though it ought to have been in all then, and now ſhould be, and is only their own fault then and now, in whom it was, and is not written, and they all juſtly periſh for want thereof.

The difference lies not therefore in Gods diſpenſation, the matter diſpenſed, or the ſubjects to whom it is diſpenſed, but in the manner and meaſure of diſpenſing, then more darkly, now more cleerly; then more ſparingly, now more fully, *Heb.* 1. 1. And this ſhall ſuffice for reply to what he ſaid againſt my firſt argument.

Next, hee comes to my proofes: and firſt the Antecedent or Aſſumption, That the covenant made with *Abraham* and his poſterity before Chriſt and this ſince Chriſt is the ſame: This I proved by three Reaſons: The firſt this; the Goſpel is the Doctrine of the covenant; but this was preached to *Abraham*, to the *Jewes* in the wilderneſſe, and in *Davids* time; *Ergo*, the covenant is the ſame in all.

To which he Anſwreth, is this a good proof that the covenant is the ſame? ſurely no: For then to whomſoever the Goſpel is preached, they are in the covenant, though they be ſcoffing *Athenians*: as *Act.* 17. and concludes, that there is no more in my proofe.

Reply. Firſt, is this a good anſwer? and doth this confute what I ſaid, that the Goſpel was preached to *Abraham*, &c? Surely no; for there is no more in all hee ſayes then this, that it was not a covenant to ſcoffing *Athenians* who received it not by outward ſubjection unto it.

Secondly,

Secondly, there is therefore a difference to be put between people to whom the Goſpell is preached; to ſome it is preached to be received: ſo to *Abraham*, *Athenians*, &c. to ſome as having received it; ſo to the *Jewes* ſucceeding, and to the Churches of the *Gentiles*.

Thirdly, the Goſpell is the promiſe, the promiſe is the covenant; (he grants this afterward) the ſumme wherof is, *I will be thy God, and the God of thy ſeed*, if thou wilt accept of it, and will bleſſe thee and thy ſeed with forgiveneſs of ſin, and life in my Son, whom I will ſend in the fleſh, if you will believe in him. This God preached to *Abraham* and the *Athenians*; *Abraham* accepting, he was in the covenant; if he had not accepted it, he had not been in the covenant; as the *Athenians* were not, becauſe they accepted it not, yet ſhould have been, if they had received the offer of God as well as *Abraham*.

Fourthly, the Goſpel is the doctrine of the covenant, or materially the covenant it ſelf, and being from firſt to laſt but one, *Gal.* 1. 6. on Gods part diſpenſed to *Abraham* and his family to be received, and on their part received, continued to the *Jewes* till Chriſt on Gods part, (being that which made them his people in covenant, and of the Church in all Apoſtaſies and Idolatries, *&c.* till God caſt them off) and after derived to the *Gentiles*, and believed by them, it cannot but be really the ſame covenant on Gods part, to all to whom it was offered, and on their part who receive it, as offered by God, and they that receive it not will be guilty of refuſing Gods covenant of grace and life, and periſh juſtly. More therefore there is in the proofe then he would take notice of; or knew how to anſwer, and therefore thought it his beſt way to ſay nothing.

My ſecond Reaſon to prove the ſecond covenant was the ſame in all the three periods is this: If *Abraham* be the father equally of *Jews* and *Gentiles*, as hee believes, and they his children equally, as believing the righteouſneſſe of faith, then the covenant is the ſame. But *Abraham* is equally father of *Jewes* and *Gentiles*, equally as he believes, and they his children equally as believing, *Rom.* 4. 11. *Gal.* 3. 7. *Ergo*, The covenant is the ſame, becauſe the promiſe of the righteouſneſſe of faith is the covenant on Gods part held forth.

To this hee anſwereth; The argument hath no force at all to prove that the covenant made with *Abraham* and his poſterity before Chriſt and this ſince Chriſt is the ſame.

Reply. What force there is in this argument let others judge, and that they may more fully do it, I ſhall ſet it down in cleer terms thus:

thus: If the matter of the covenant, and the conditions required of all that will be partakers of the covenant be the ſame, then the covenant is the ſame in all the three periods. But the matter of the covenant, and the conditions required of all that will be partakers of it, are the ſame in all the three periods; *Ergo*, The covenant is the ſame.

The firſt Propoſition is evident: For, as all to whom the Law is preſcribed, and the condition of works and ſelf-righteouſneſſe is required of them, they are all under the covenant of works: ſo all to whom the righteouſneſſe of faith is held forth, and the condition of faith is required of them, they receiving it and ſubmitting, are all under the ſame covenant of grace.

The ſecond Propoſition is as manifeſt: *Rom.* 4. 13. 14. 16. that faith was required of *Abraham*, *Iſaac*, and *Jacob*, will not be denied, and was performed by them, *Heb.* 11. That Gods righteouſneſſe was offered, and faith in it required of the *Jewes* in *Moſes* time, and after, is evident, becauſe they were blamed every where for not believing; and the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 9. 31, 32. ſhewed that they came ſhort of Gods righteouſneſſe, becauſe they ſought it not by faith; and himſelf hath ſaid before, and preſently after ſaith again, that they were cut off by unbelief. If they were cut off by, and for unbelief, then certainly they ſtood by faith, and that was required of them: and ſo they in the wilderneſſe were ſhut out of Gods reſt (that is, Gods righteouſneſſe in Chriſt) becauſe they mixed not the Goſpell with faith where they heard it, *Heb.* 4. 2. That the righteouſneſſe of God is preached to the *Gentiles*, and faith required of them, himſelf every where affirmeth; therefore the concluſion, that the covenant in all the three periods is the ſame, is undeniable. Yet ſeeing he ſets down ſundry conſiderations, upon which he ſaid as he did; I ſhall attend to heare him: And firſt, he ſaith, if none be *Abrahams* children but ſuch as believe the righteouſneſſe of faith, then none but ſuch as believe are within the covenant and to be baptized; but the firſt is true, *Ergo*, the ſecond.

Reply. Firſt, What is this to the argument? How doth this cleer that there is no force in it to prove the covenant now and then to be the ſame? If I ſhould grant him all this, yet my argument is of force, the covenant may be the ſame, though none but ſuch as believe in the righteouſneſſe of God be in the covenant, and ſo to be ſealed: for, ſecondly, any are ſaid to be in the covenant in a twofold reſpect: Firſt,

First, as to take God to be their God, and of their seed, to work faith in them who can never believe of themselves, unlesse God give them to believe, which hee works in all in whom it is wrought, in the first instant, without any actuall concourse of power to make the dead soul live, and become active through his assistance.

Secondly, as none actually believing and professing the same, which to men-ward may seem to be true, but is not alwayes so indeed; If hee mean that none but of the second sort are in the covenant, and are to be baptized, I deny it, and do affirm, that Infants of such as do actually believe and professe, are under Gods covenant and promise with their parents, to work the faith in them that he hath wrought in their parents, as I shall make further proof of afterward.

Secondly, he saith, the body of the *Jewish* nation were the posterity of *Abraham*, according to the flesh, were commanded to be circumcised as so in the covenant, and otherwise could not have been of the *Jewish* Church. They were not to bring their sacrifices to the Temple, nor eat the Passeover; therefore these were legally in the covenant, though but the posterity of *Abraham* according to the flesh; yet none of the uncircumsion might before Christs time partake of those priviledges, though they did believe. The difference therefore was very great.

Reply. That the *Jewish* Nation was *Abrahams* posterity according to the flesh, who knowes not? yet that they were thereby of the Church is not true, and that they were in covenant before, and Church-members, is certain, though he affirm the contrary never so often, without any proof at all; for circumcision followes the covenant at Church state, being a sign of it, doth not go before it, as is evident in *Abrahams* case and his families; as also in *Isaacs* case, and all following him, who were not circumcised at the 8th day, but as in the covenant before; and how could a *Jew*, being uncircumcised, be cut off from his people, and despise Gods covenant, if he had not interest in that estate before? And were not those many hundred in *Abrahams* family, and all proselytes after in the covenant, and of the Church, though not of *Abrahams* posterity in the flesh? This is not required therefore to make them of the *Jewish* Church, nor was it sufficient to be *Abrahams* posterity, and circumcised, to make them in the covenant and in the Church, and no more required, as in *Esaus* case, and the rest of *Abrahams* children by *Ketura*,

where

where hee ſaith, they were legally in the covenant, though but *Abrahams* poſterity. I reply, More was required of them to be in the covenant, then to be *Abrahams* poſterity in the fleſh, even to be the Lords, to have *Abrahams* faith wrought in them, without w^ch^ they could not be, or continue in the covenant. If he mean by legally in the covenant, they were in a legall covenant, a covenant of works, it is contrary to the Scriptures, *Galat.* 3. 17, 18. Now was there any ſuch covenant diſpenſed unto them by God? But if he mean they were in the ſame covenant we have, but legally being perverted by them contrary to the doctrine of God, he grants what I ſaid, and contradicts himſelfe. Further, he ſaith, none uncircumciſed before Chriſts time, may partake in thoſe priviledges, though they did beleeve.

Reply. It is not true: For *Enoch*, *Noah*, *Melchiſedec*, and many others, were partakers of ſome of them, before circumciſion was inſtituted, and all they in the wilderneſſe during the fourty years travell there. Though therefore the difference was very great in many circumſtances, yet it was the ſame in ſubſtance; which is that I ſaid.

A third conſideration he hath, is this, No Gentiles are *Abrahams* ſeed at all, but by beleeving the righteouſneſſe of faith, although he be the child of beleeving parents.

Reply. Firſt, I deny it: For the infants of beleeving Gentiles in covenant, are *Abrahams* ſeed, though they doe not actually beleeve; as the infants of Proſelytes Gentiles before Chriſt, were *Abrahams* ſeed with their beleeving parents.

Secondly, none of the Jewiſh parents or children, were *Abrahams* ſeed, but by actually beleeving the righteouſneſſe of faith, or under the promiſe of God to work it in them, *Rom.* 9. 6, 8. But what is this to the diſproof of my Argument, That the covenant with *Abraham* then and now is the ſame? I ſee not a word to that purpoſe.

A fourth conſideration he thus ſets downe, None of the Jewes themſelves, *Abrahams* naturall ſeed, and partakers of all the orders of the Old Teſtament, by vertue of that naturall relation, could bee admitted to be baptized, but upon manifeſtation of faith. Therefore the covenant before, and this ſince, is not the ſame.

Reply. Firſt, all *Abrahams* naturall ſeed, were not partakers of all ordinances of the old Teſtament, by vertue of that relation, as *Eſaus* poſterity, nor was that relation neceſſary: for then no Proſelyte could have enjoyed them.

Second-

Secondly, the natural poſterity of *Abraham* did partake of thoſe ordinances by vertue of the covenant, or their actuall faith; and therefore enjoyed them no longer then their covenant and faith continued.

Thirdly, it followeth not that the covenant now and then is not the ſame, becauſe the Jewes of yeares were not baptized without manifeſtation of their faith: for the difference onely is circumſtantiall; *viz.* the manifeſtation of their faith in Chriſt the Meſſiah now come, which before they beleeved ſhould come: nor will he ever prove, that the infants of thoſe Jewes, beleeving and baptized, were not alſo baptized with their parents. And this of his conſiderations to my ſecond Reaſon; my third Reaſon followeth.

The ſtanding of the Jewes, and of us Gentiles in the grace of God, is the ſame with *Abrahams*, therefore the Covenant is the ſame.

To this he anſwereth, Firſt, diſtinguiſhing of the word *Grace*, which is taken (ſaith he) particularly for the covenant of life, generally for any effect of Gods goodneſſe, whereby he freely communicateth any benefits unto the ſonnes of men: which muſt needs be by grace, ſeeing no man deſerveth any thing.

Secondly, he applieth this diſtinction, and ſaith, that if grace be taken in the firſt ſenſe, and particularly for the covenant of everlaſting life unto free juſtification, hee denieth that the Jewes were required to manifeſt their intereſt therein, before they could be admitted to ſtand members of the Jewiſh viſible Church ſtate; as all both Jews and Gentiles muſt now ſince the death of Chriſt, and yet none ſaved but by grace in this firſt ſenſe. But if grace be taken in the latter and more generall ſenſe, for ſome effect of Gods goodneſſe communicated freely to any in any kinde of benefit, then he granteth that the Iewes ſtood under the ſame grace of God with *Abraham*, and had circumciſion and other ordinances to lead them to Chriſt to come, yea to be born of their ſeed, according to the fleſh: And in theſe reſpects the Jewes ſtanding was the ſame with *Abrahams*; and theſe reſpects are ſpoken of by *Mary*, *Luke* 1.54,55. and *Zachary*, *Luke* 1.72,73

Rep. Firſt, the diſtinction is not neceſſary: for though in a general ſenſe any thing from God may be called a grace, as it is a free gift of God to them them that never deſerve it; yet in this diſcourſe, and uſually in the Scriptures, it is not uſed in this larger ſenſe.

Second-

Secondly, to make those priviledges of the Jewes to be but effects of common grace, he wrongeth the grace of God, as dispensing nothing more of particular favour to the Jewes then to the Gentiles, though they had more and larger matters then the Gentiles. Yet being from common grace, it alters not the state of them under Gods grace from the Heathens, whom in this case God leaveth not without witnesse of himself.

Thirdly, in that he saith, the Jewes had circumcision and other Ordinances leading them to Christ, and that Christ should be born of their seed after the flesh. And in these respects they stood in the same grace with *Abraham*.

Reply. First, *Abraham* had not those ordinances which they had, their standing therefore in these things differ.

Secondly, these were not all the respects: for the passages in *Luke* 1. *vers.* 54. speak of other things; namely, remission of sinnes, justification and sanctification. In a word, did not Christ come of *Terah* as well as of *Abraham*; yea, of *Noah*, *Sem*, &c? read *Luke* 3. And did they not beleeve in him to come? *Heb.* 11.7. and how can any exclude them before *Abraham*, of this priviledge, (yea and the Gentiles also with them, before the time of distinction of the people) more then them after, in the due and proper consideration of the thing it selfe?

But to say no more, I come to the other sense of the word *Grace*, and did, and doe intend my reason in that acceptation. But here he denies that ever the Jewes were required to make any such manifestation to make them members of that Church before Christ, as all Jewes and Gentiles since must doe to make them members of a Church now.

Reply. First, *Abraham* and his Males made such a protestation, and all Proselytes that ever after joyned, without which they had not been members, as having no other relation; and besides, the seale should have been set upon them, as the seale of the righteousnesse of faith which they had not.

Secondly, the Jewes after *Moses* time were required first and last to make such manifestation of their faith in Gods righteousnesse, and they sinned and were liable to Gods displeasure when they failed, were often punished, and at last cast off for want of it, which could not have been, if it had not been required of them.

Thirdly, suppose that there was not the like manifestation required

quired of them, that is now, yet the ſame thing was required of them that was of *Abraham*, and is now of us, namely faith in Gods righteouſneſſe. And therefore though they then and wee now, ſhould differ in this reſpect, that there was not ſuch a manifeſtation of faith required, as is now, yet the covenant may be, & is the ſame now and then, the manifeſtation being not the covenant, but a circumſtance about the covenant.

To conclude, if the matter propounded in all theſe three periods, not excluding the firſt in the time before *Abraham*, be the ſame, *viz.* Gods righteouſneſſe, the Word of Gods grace and the Goſpel, if the condition required of all bee the ſame, *viz.* faith in Gods righteouſneſſe; And if the effect be the ſame in all that doe beleeve, *viz.* that they that beleeve are freely juſtified by Chriſt, without the deeds of the Law, though the elect onely obtaine, and the reſt refuſe, are hardened and periſh for ever for their ſinfull unbeliefe; then the covenant is the ſame in all theſe three periods, as I firſt propounded, and my proofes are full and cleare for this purpoſe, come not ſhort at all, nor are taken away, as hee would perſwade himſelfe: but I queſtion not but others will ſee that he is much miſtaken, many of the things he ſpeakes, being not onely unſound, but abſurd and uncongruous to wholeſome doctrine. It followeth, that I next goe on with him about the conſequent from this antecedent, which he ſuppoſeth he hath taken away, and ſo the conſequences therefrom will fall and faile alſo; and certainly ſo they would, if he had taken away the antecedent, and therefore hee might have ſpared his labour in ſeeking to diſprove them, and the proofes I added. But it ſeems he thought not as he ſaid, and therefore he ſetteth down my conſequence, and the proofes thereof, and ſeekes to overthrow them all, as he hath done my antecedent.

My firſt conſequent was, that ſeeing the covenant with *Abraham*, the Jewes and us Gentiles, is the ſame: Therefore as infants were then in covenant, ſo they are now in covenant ſince Chriſt.

To cleare this conſequence to be juſt, I added (as hee ſets them down) foure reaſons.

The firſt; Elſe the covenant were not the ſame, in all, as I have proved it is. He anſwereth, he hath diſproved my proofes of that particular, and therefore this reaſon is nothing.

Reply. How hee hath diſproved my proofes, others ſhall judge, and I have removed thoſe diſproofes of his; and therefore this

Reason is something, and the Consequence thereby certain.

My second Reason; Else the state of Gods grace should bee straitned, and made of lesse extent by Christs comming, then it was before; whereas it is more enlarged, and of greater extent, there being then no more in the state of persons to interest infants into the covenant, then now.

To this he answereth diversly, denying the consequence, that is, that unlesse infants be now in the covenant, as they were then, the state of Gods grace is straitned, and made of lesse extent by Christs comming.

First, saith he, because the preaching of the Gospel is as full, as large and ample a testimony of Gods grace, as any of the fleshly seed of *Abraham* had by the covenant, and larger. The Gospel preached now is a fuller declaration of the grace of God, and the benefits that come by Christ, then ever circumcision, and the ordinances of the old Testament did declare to them. The fleshly seed had but the declaration of the grace of God by the covenant: now the seed of the Gentiles, beleevers and unbeleevers, are made partakers of the preaching of the Gospel, though they be not in the covenant.

Reply. First, he seemeth to oppose the preaching of the Gospel now, to the former times, as if the Gospel were not preached unto them all that time; for in this passage (Gospel now preached, and Covenant then) is a direct opposition: And so in the next branch he oppoſeth Circumcision, and the Ordinances of the old Testament, to the Gospel preached now; as if the Gospel preached, were peculiar to the new Testament, contrary to the Scriptures.

Secondly, I affirme, and none can deny, that there is not any point of doctrine held forth by the Gospel in the New Testament, nor any grace of God, or effect thereof, but it was held forth then in the Old, though more darkly, then & sparingly, yet the same in both. And therefore it is not right that he saith, The Ordinances of the Old Testament did not make so full a declaration of Gods grace, as the Gospel preached now doth, unlesse he mean it of the measure and manner, and then it is not to the purpose hee should aim at.

Thirdly, I suppose it is evident, that since Christs comming for many hundred yeares under the state of the Apostles, there was a little preaching of the Gospel, and declaration of the grace of God,

God, as ever was by the dispensation of the old Testament, for the most part.

Fourthly, whereas he saith, that *Abrahams* fleshly seed had but a declaration of Gods grace by the covenant (adding though the beleeving seed of *Abraham* had the grace of God in Christ declared them, of wch I confesse I can make no sense; and besides, they include a flat contradiction: but now the seed of the Gentile beleevers, and unbeleevers, have the Gospel preached to them though not in covenant.

Reply. First, I understand not what difference hee would put between the declaration of the grace of God in Christ, and preaching of the Gospel; in my apprehension there is no more then in preaching the Gospel and preaching the Gospel: for surely the preaching of the Gospel is the declaration of the grace of God in Christ, and declaration of Gods grace in Christ, is preaching the Gospel, and Circumcision and the other Ordinances together, with the Word preached, did as truly hold forth Gods grace in Christ, and the benefits thereof, as the Gospel now preached doth, and the Ordinances of the new Testament: onely the difference lies in Christ to come, and now come; as also in the measure and manner of the dispensation, and not altogether in the matter.

Secondly, he saith, that the seed of the Gentiles, beleevers, and unbeleevers, are made partakers of larger graces in having the Gospel preached unto them, being not in covenant, then the fleshly seed had been in covenant.

Reply. First, *Abraham* had the Gospel first preached unto him, when he was an unbeleever, and not in covenant. But was it larger grace to have it preached unto him when he was not in covenant, then when he was? Surely no.

2dly, ,that the Gentiles were made partakers of greater grace by being out of covenant, then the Jews by being in covenant, is an unreasonable speech: for in that respect they are set one against another, the Gospel was preached unto them both; and therefore unlesse he deny this, he cannot avoid the blame of the former.

Besides, the Jewes had the Oracles of God, the adoption, the promises, &c. *Rom.* 9. 4. by being in covenant; but the Gentiles had nothing visible, wherby they might be accounted partakers of Gods grace, till they were in covenant: and therfore the Jews had larger grace then the Gentiles beleeving or not beleeving, not being in covenant, &c.

A ſecond anſwer he gives to overthrow my Conſequence, That if infants be not in the covenant now, the grace of God is ſtraitned by Chriſts comming, is this; The grace of God is now revealed to more people then before: Then it was confirmed to the people of the Jewes onely, but now it is commanded to bee preached to all Nations. Therefore the excluſion of Infants doth not ſtraiten the grace of God at all.

Reply 1. That the declaration of the grace of God was limited to the Jewes, but now is common to all Nations, I grant; as alſo, that there is a more full and clear declaration of that grace of God now, then in former times. Yea, if he can lay down more reſpects, wherein Gods grace is enlarged now, above what it was then; I ſhould well approve of it, yet this toucheth not my argument that I alledged, and ſtill affirm, that the grace of God is now more ſtraitned then it was then, if infants be not now in the covenant, as then they were. And that beſides others in a twofold reſpect: Eirſt, in reſpect of Infants themſelves, who in this abounding of grace diſpenſed, are excluded and ſhut out by the God of that grace, when before they were not; and therefore to them it is ſtraitned.

Secondly, in reſpect of Parents, who then looked upon their Infants as the Lords equally with themſelves; but now they look upon their Infants as aliens, without God and Chriſt: and have no more intereſt in them then an Indian child hath: nor are any Parents or others to account of their children any otherwiſe then they doe of the Infant of an Indian.

So that this diſcourſe medleth not with my Argument, nor the ſcope of it, nor are his anſwers to the purpoſe, that ſhould cleare this, that the grace of God is not ſtraitned now more then then; though Infants were excluded, which were not then.

It may be yet his third anſwer will doe that, which is this;

If by extenſion of grace I doe conceive that ever God accepted any into the covenant of everlaſting life, as the fleſhly ſeed of *Abraham*, without inherent faith, and thereupon conclude, that much more now are the ſeed of beleevers taken into the covenant, by their parents faith, I erre, and hee abſolutely denies any ſuch thing then or now, &c.

Reply. Firſt, here is not one word to my argument, hee forgets what hee was a doing, and falls into a ſuppoſition, hee doth not ſhew, that if Infants bee not now in the covenant, the grace of God

God is ſtraitned, becauſe then Infants were. Secondly, that Infants were then in the covenant, is not, cannot be denied.

That the covenant on Gods part diſpenſed, was the covenant of everlaſting life, is evident, becauſe it was an offer of God unto them, to become their God, and their ſeeds God, to bleſſe them with the forgiveneſſe of ſins in his Son, called the righteouſneſſe of Faith.

Though it was not a covenant of life to all, through their own default, and they will be guilty of refuſing everlaſting life offered unto them.

That all Infants had not inherent faith in them when they were Infants, and yet accepted of God into covenant of everlaſting life, to work that faith in them; yea, though elect, as *Paul* for inſtance; but had it wrought in them afterward by God in the mean he vouchſafed, and that from and according to the covenant he had taken them into: And if God then did thus diſpenſe his grace, as to take Infants into that covenant, the covenant of everlaſting life, not having inherent faith in themſelves, but that he might work it in them; Then if now Infants be excluded, it argues that Gods grace is not ſo large as it was then, he doth not give himſelf to be the God of our Infants to bleſſe them in his Son, as hee did give himſelf to them to be the God of their Infants for to bleſſe them.

That God received none of *Abrahams* poſterity into any covenant as his fleſhly ſeed, and in that reſpect, becauſe they were ſo, is ſo certain, that I conceive it to be a certain error to affirm it, *Abraham* being ſet forth as the father of all nations, in that tranſaction between God and him, and not as the father of the *Jewes* only, who were his fleſhly ſeed. Nor do I think that Infants now are received into covenant as fleſhly ſeed of *Gentiles*, nor by their parents faith, as being any cauſe of it, but only as *Iſaac*, &c. were of old by Gods free grace, taking the believing parents with their children into a covenant, in whom he worketh faith, to cloſe with him, and undertakes to work the ſame in their children after; for which purpoſe hee taketh hold of them by his covenant; and let all that know the truth, judge whether hee or I do erre, I in affirming, or he denying theſe things, though he do it never ſo abſolutely.

Laſt of all to this conſectary which I added; that there was nothing then ~~in the ſtate of~~ perſons to intereſt Infants in the covenant more then now; hee giveth this anſwer: Though there was

nothing

nothing in the ſtate of perſons, yet there was ſomething in things and order of times, Chriſt being yet to come; and here hee concludeth two things:

Firſt, that the whole fleſhly ſeed of *Abraham* ſeparated by ceremoniall holineſſe was a type of Chriſt to come, and therefore Infants then in the covenant, and but ceremonially holy.

Secondly, that Chriſt the thing typified being come, all that typicall ſtate is utterly aboliſhed, *&c.* Infants now not to be in it.

Reply. Firſt, I deny that the fleſhly ſeed of *Abraham* was a type of Chriſt, and have ſpoken to it before, and do conceive it a very erroneous conceit, and full of abſurdities.

Secondly, wee muſt then exclude grown men alſo upon the ſame ground from the covenant and Baptiſme now; for if they were a type, therefore children then in covenant and circumciſed, but now not in covenant and baptized; men alſo being a part of the type muſt now not be in covenant, nor be baptized; or elſe Infants may.

Thirdly, all proſelytes could not be a type of Chriſt, becauſe not of the fleſhly ſeed of *Abraham*, nor *Abraham* and his family, with all thoſe ſucceeding till *Moſes* time, becauſe the ceremoniall ordinances were not yet inſtituted, nor doth the circumſtance of things and time put any eſſentiall difference between them and us, it being the ſame Chriſt, then by thoſe things, and in that time diſpenſed, that is now by theſe things, and in this time, not any other, nor any thing elſe; but I have ſaid enough for this in ſome *Reply* before, and ſo much to his anſwer to my ſecond Reaſon.

A third Reaſon, whereby I proved Infants to be in the covenant now as they were then, was this, as he hath ſet it down: for I cannot remember that I uſed it here, *Abraham* being the root, and *Jews* and *Gentiles* the branches, as when the *Jews* were broken off, as well Infants as men of yeers were broken off; ſo the *Gentiles* being planted in their ſtead, they muſt be Infants as well as men of yeers. And ſo the *Jews*, when they ſhall be again implanted, as well infants as men of yeers ſhall be ſo.

To this hee anſwereth: Firſt, hee conceives Chriſt to be the root here meant.

Reply. Then they were in Chriſt, with, of and from Infants, alſo without actuall faith or unbelief. Again, that Chriſt is the root of *Abraham* himſelf, and all elſe I queſtion not; but that Chriſt is not meant here, *Rom.* 11. 4. I am confident, and no man will affirm that

reades

readesthe Chapter with understanding: *Rom.* 11. 28. they are said to be beloved for the Fathers sake; not that *Abraham*, or Christ are equally a root, or at all in the same respect and sense, but in a diverse: Christ the reall and efficient root, *Abraham* but fœderally, and in regard of Gods covenant made with him as a father of many nations; but I shall say no more hereto, because himself admits it, and answereth:

Secondly, the *Gentiles* are not branches in a naturall relation, nor the *Jews* branches in a spirituall relation, but by personall faith. To make *Jews* and *Gentiles* equally branches, therefore of the root of *Abraham*, wee must make the relation spirituall which is proper to them both.

Reply. First he contradicteth himself in these words, saying the *Jews* are not branches by a spirituall relation, and yet they and the *Gentiles* cannot be equally branches, but by a spirituall relation: Further, if he mean by faith personall, habituall as well as actuall, and excludes not habituall, I consent, for Infants may have habituall that cannot have actuall; while Infants and many men may seem to have actuall saving faith, that have not true saving habituall faith.

Secondly, if he mean by spirituall relation fœderall, I also grant what he saith; but if he mean by personall faith actuall, and by spirituall, saving faith. I reply, all the *Jews* had not actuall faith then, nor *Gentiles* now, who yet professe actuall faith then, and now, nor had Infants their actuall faith no more then they can have now; and yet they were branches of the Olive then, which hee concludes cannot be but by personall faith, (it being not by naturall relation) which now *Gentiles* Infants may have, as well as they had, or whatsoever else those Infants had, whereby those Infants were branches of their own Olive tree.

To that I say, that when the *Jewes* were broken off, as well Infants, as men of yeeres were broken off: hee answereth, it is true; because the naturall relation in the covenant ceased, when Christ the promised seed came, and now there is no relation in the covenant with *Abraham*, but by faith in Christ.

Reply. First, this contradicteth that which in the foregoing answer he seemed to set down; that there must be such a spirituall relation as is possible to them both, and that is faith; for no otherwise can the *Jewes* and *Gentiles* suit, nor could they have been broken

broken off by unbeliefe (which maketh not the *Jews* ceaſe to have a naturall relation to *Abraham*) unleſſe faith was required of them; and yet here he ſaith they were in covenant by naturall relation.

Secondly, the *Jewes* were not in covenant by naturall relation, and as a type of Chriſt (which hee ſaid before, and I have diſproved) but *Abraham* was the father of *Jewes* and *Gentiles*, as hee believed, and they his children, as believing, and no otherwiſe, as is cleer, *Rom.* 4. 9. 14. the Apoſtle ſhewing that hee was heir of the world, not through the Law, bnt the righteouſneſſe of faith, to the *Gentiles*, though uncircumciſed, and not to the *Jewes*, though circumciſed, but as they walked in the ſteps of that faith of *Abraham*, which he had, being yet uncircumciſed; beſides, if they had been in the covenant by naturall relation, how could thoſe many hundreds in *Abrahams* family be in the covenant, who were not of *Abrahams* fleſh? or how could *Iſhmael* or *Eſau* ceaſe to be in the covenant, being *Abrahams* naturall ſeed? Whereas I ſaid, when the *Jewes* be again implanted, as well Infants of ſuch as believe, as men of yeeres ſhall be implanted: He anſwereth; as unbelief did break them off, ſo faith only muſt graffe them in; but that Infants of the *Jews* being members of that Church before Chriſts coming ſhall be planted, ſo as to be members of a Chriſtian Church without manifeſtation of faith lawfully, can no way be proved, but is an abſolute error.

Reply. Dictator-like; but firſt, Why may not Infants be now implanted without manifeſtation of faith, and ſo be of a Chriſtian Church, as then they were of that Church without ſuch manifeſtation of faith?

Secondly, ſuch a faith may graffe Infants in again, as is oppoſite to the unbeliefe that cut them off; that faith therefore (or whatſoever it was) that made them branches of that root, and for want whereof they were cut off, the ſame may graffe them in; nor can any man render a reaſonable cauſe, why hee ſhould deny it. It is therefore too peremptory to ſay it is an abſolute error, and his bare ſaying will never prove it to be ſo, but himſelfe to be too raſh, and unadviſed.

My fourth Reaſon to prove Infants are now in the covenant, as they were then, is thus: If the *Jewes* and *Gentiles* be incorporate into one body in Chriſt, and the *Jewiſh* Infants were in the body, then

then ſo may and muſt Infants of believing *Gentiles* now be *verum prius*. To this hee anſwereth two things:

Firſt, the *Jews* had means before, and ſome of them faith by thoſe means, and ſo true members of Chriſt, hee the head, and they the body, there being no other members known but the *Jewes*. The *Gentiles* by Chriſt coming, had this ſpeciall benefit, to have the means, and faith by the means, and thereby united to Chriſt the head, and ſo to *Jews* the body, and the *Jewes* had no other relation to Chriſt the head, but by faith, and the *Gentiles* to Chriſt, nor ſhem but by faith.

Reply. Firſt, where hee ſaith ſome of the *Jews* had faith, and were true members; if hee means ſaving faith, and ſavingly, his argument runs not, becauſe the faith of the *Gentiles* and their union with Chriſt was not ſaving, and ſavingly in all, as *Simon Magus*, *Judas*, &c. If he means it generally, according to charity, then more *Jews* had faith then ſome, that had true faith, and were true members, even all fœderally in regard of profeſſion; nor is it true, that there were no members known, and of that body then, but *Jewes*, for the many hundreds in *Abrahams* family, and very many proſelytes, were known members of that body, and yet were not *Jewes*.

Secondly, there is two wayes of being united to Chriſt the head, and to the body *Jewiſh* then and of the *Jews* and *Gentiles* now; the firſt is fœderally, ſacramentally, outwardly, and viſibly, ſo all the *Jewes* were then the body, and all of it, as is cleer, 1 *Cor.* 10. 1, &c. all baptized, all eating and drinking one and the ſame Baptiſme: Manna, Rock (as the Apoſtle ſaith, we are one body, by being baptized into one Chriſt, and by eating and drinking one bread & cup, by one Spirit a body myſticall, 1 *Cor.* 12, 13. *Acts* 7.38. The ſecond is really, ſpiritually, and effectually, inwardly, and inviſibly. In the firſt ſenſe, the elect and reprobate are both conſidered; ſo many as the Lord calls by means: In the ſecond ſenſe, the elect only are to be conſidered, whether of *Jews* or *Gentiles*; that there are theſe two ſorts of being in Chriſt, is evident from many Scriptures: *Joh.* 15. 1. two ſorts of branches, one fruitfull, and ſhall be ſaved, the other unfruitfull, and ſhall be damned, *Mat.* 22. 14. *Many are called, but few are choſen*; Many are called, and not choſen, many are called, and choſen: and all this is true of the *Jewiſh* ſtate before Chriſt, as is cleer in the ſeven firſt verſes, and all is true likewiſe of the ſtate after Chriſt, as is plain in the reſt, and of both, 14. All the *Jewes* therefore (though

not ſavingly) from *Abraham* to Chriſt, were that body ſucceſſively, and the *Gentiles* ſince Chriſts time added to that body, by being made neer; no alteration of the *Jewes*, as the body in the reall and eſſentiall conſideration of it, but an acceſſe of the *Gentiles* to them, which our Saviour alſo in another place expreſſeth, *John* 10. 16. Other ſheep I have which are not of this fold, and I muſt bring them into it, that there may be but one fold, and one Shepherd: For *Rom.* 11. 17. ſome of the branches were broken off, not all, and thou wert graffed in amongſt them; therefore as *Jewiſh* Infants were then in the fold, and members of the body all along; ſo it muſt be granted, that the Infants of Believing *Gentiles* now added to the body and fold are in it.

His ſecond anſwer is this: Firſt, that the *Gentiles* by converſion, did not enter into the *Jewiſh* nationall Church.

Secondly, if neither *Jews* nor *Gentiles* were the body of Chriſt, conſiderably as a nation, but only by converſion, then were not the *Jews* as *Jews* of the body, and conſequently not their Infants. But neither *Jewes* nor *Gentiles* were the body of Chriſt conſiderably, as a nation, but by converſion, therefore neither *Jewes* as *Jewes* were of the body, nor their Infants; and conſequently not the Infants of the *Gentiles*.

Reply. Firſt, he ſeemeth to reſtrain the being of the body to the preſent *Jewes* in Chriſts time, which is erroneous, and denies it of the former.

Secondly, the proſelytes of the *Gentiles* before Chriſt, did by converſion enter into fellowſhip with the *Jewiſh* nationall Church, and their Infants with them.

Thirdly, the *Jewes* were not the body, as a nation, yet the nation was the body, and that fœderally, God taking hold of them by his covenant, and making them unto himſelf an holy nation, as well Infants as others, *Exod.* 19. 6. *Deut.* 29. 11. 14, 15. at the firſt conſtitution they were the body by converſion, at leaſt appearingly; But ever after, all ſucceeding were the body; for to be truly converted, on Gods part promiſed, though on their part not alwayes injoyed through their own default. Next, he comes to my other conſequence, which is this; ſeeing Infants are now in the covenant, as theſe were then in the covenant, therefore Infants ought now to be baptized, as then they were circumciſed, ſealed with the ſign of the covenant now, as they were ſealed with the ſign of the covenant then.

To

To cleer this, my firſt Reaſon was thus, elſe the covenant were not the ſame, and Infants in it : Hee anſwers that it is not the ſame in reſpect of naturall relation to *Abraham*, as hee had ſhewed, and therefore Infants not in it.

Reply. Firſt, he here holdeth the *Jewes* to have fellowſhip in the covenant before Chriſt by vertue of naturall relation; and yet he ſaid before that they were not the body (which they were by covenant) as *Jewes*, that is by naturall relation.

Secondly, I have ſhewed before, that the *Jewes* were not in that covenant by naturall relation, but by faith, which is the only condition of the covenant.

Thirdly, it no way followeth it is not the ſame, in reſpect of naturall relation, therefore it is not the ſame at all, nor doth it hinder Infants being in it, becauſe they now have no naturall relation to *Abraham*; for the proſelyte Infants were taken in of old into fellowſhip with the Jewes in that covenant, but not in reſpect of naturall relation, which they have not; the reaſon there remains firm, and unanſwered.

My ſecond was this; if they had the thing and ſubſtance, they cannot be denied the ſeal and circumſtance, if the firſt grace, then the ſecond, and confirming. Hee anſwereth, it is true, when they or any other for them can manifeſt, that they have the thing and ſubſtance, then let them have the ſeal and circumſtance.

Reply. Firſt, he denies not that they have the thing, though they cannot manifeſt it.

Secondly, if I may conclude they have the thing, and cannot (by a rule) conclude they have not, then though they cannot manifeſt it, yet I may feel them, and what more can be, when they do manifeſt; I may be miſtaken, I cannot conclude infallibly they have the thing.

Thirdly, the Jews Infants were not able to manifeſt the thing, yet circumciſed; and why may not Infants be baptized, though they cannot manifeſt the ſubſtance, ſeeing they may have it.

Laſt of all, there is a double conſideration of our being in Chriſtian ſtate, one fœderall, and outward, the other ſpirituall alſo, and inward: there is a double conſideration of Baptiſme, (as of Circumciſion) the one outward, the other inward alſo; now man applies on his part the outward baptiſme, to one that is outwardly in Chriſtian ſtate (as Infants are) it belonging to man to do no more;

and if hee ſhould commonly apply it to them that are not ſpirituall in that ſtate, nor ever ſhall be, yet herein hee ſins not, but doth that he ought to do, in applying to the ſubject what belongs to it in reſpect of that, which in the ſubject is proportionable to what hee doth.

My third Reaſon to prove that infants, being now in the covenant as theirs, and therefore ought to be now baptized, as then circumciſed, was this: By vertue of this word to *Abraham, I will be thy God, and the God of thy ſeed*, Infants of old were included, and therefore circumciſed, and the ſame promiſe belongeth to the *Gentiles* in the ſame ſtate, as to *Jewes*, therefore the Infants of *Gentiles* are included, and muſt be baptized.

He anſwereth; firſt, that the Jews, till Chriſts time, were under that promiſe, by naturall relation only, and then they ceaſed to be under it by naturall relation, and ſo circumciſion ceaſed alſo.

Secondly, neither to Jewes nor Gentiles, is that promiſe continued in the ſame ſtate, the Gentiles being not *Abrahams* ſeed by naturall relation, and that of the Jewes ceaſed, and ſo hee concludes thus; if the covenant touching the naturall ſeed be ceaſed, then Infants are neither to be circumciſed, nor baptized: but the covenant touching the naturall ſeed ceaſed at Chriſts death, *Acts* 10. 28. *Gal.* 3. 25. *Epheſ.* 2. 14, 15. *Rom.* 11. 20. 21. *Gal.* 4. 25, 26. therefore Infants are neither to be circumciſed, nor baptized.

Reply. Firſt, it is flat contrary to Scripture, to ſay, that the Jews were under the promiſe by naturall relation, *Rom.* 9. 6. 8. the Apoſtle fully concludeth, that all are not *Iſrael*, nor under that promiſe that are of *Iſrael*, that is, as they were of the fleſh, they are not the children of *Abraham* under that promiſe; and therefore, though *Abraham* had other children, yet the promiſe was limited to *Iſaac*, yea, though *Eſau* came of *Iſaac* as well as *Jacob*, yet was the promiſe limited to *Jacob* 10. 11. though both of one father and mother, *Rom.* 4. 11. the promiſe is made to *Abraham* to be the father only of them that believe, and therefore none firſt, or laſt, then, or now, are under the promiſe by vertue of naturall relation.

Secondly, circumciſion was not applied to *Abrahams* poſterity as his naturall ſeed in that reſpect: For,

Firſt it was the ſeal of the righteouſneſſe of faith, and therefore not be adminiſtred to any, but as believing the righteouſneſſe of faith, or ſuch as God promiſed to work it in them.

Secondly,

Secondly, otherwiſe the proſelytes, and their Infants could not have been circumciſed, being not *Abrahams* poſterity in the fleſh.

Thirdly, all the Scriptures alledged by him ſpeak not of the aboliſhing of the covenant, but of ceremonies and ſhadowes diſpenſed unto them for a time, which in Chriſts death were done away; thoſe that ſeem to ſpeak of the covenant, *Rom.* 11. 20, 21. adde 7. *Gal.* 4, 25, 26. ſpeak not at all of the aboliſhing of the covenant, but of the continuance of it altogether as the ſame then and now; *Rom.* 11. ſpeaks of the Jewes being cut off by unbelief from the covenant, and not of diſanulling the covenant, and the Gentiles inſtated in that they were cut off from; that of *Gal.* 4. ſpeaks not of a change of the ſtate of the promiſe, but of the difference of perſons now, and then, under the ſame ſtate of the promiſe then and now, as it was, and is on Gods part diſpenſed: From all in brief, we may gather theſe particular concluſions:

Firſt, God made a promiſe to *Abraham*, to be his God, and the God of his ſeed, as many as ſhould believe, Jews or Gentiles, which was accepted by *Abraham* and his family, and thereupon ſealed by God.

Secondly, God continued to hold out the ſame promiſe in the ſame ſtate to the Jewes, and Proſelytes, till Chriſts time, that hee would be a God to them, and their children, as hee promiſed to *Abraham*, and perform all that good hee promiſed to *Abraham*; or promiſed him to perform to them, and ſealed their Infants to confirm all this on his part, giving all means neceſſary thereunto, nothing wanting, *Iſa.* 5. 4.

Thirdly, ſome alwayes received this good in this promiſe, through all that time, till Chriſt, and in his time, (viz. all, and only the elect) the reſt were puniſhed with a ſpirit of ſlumber for their neglect; and at laſt cut off (viz. all, and onely non-elect.)

Fourthly, God continues the ſame promiſe in the ſame ſtate unto ſome Jewes, and offers it alſo to the Gentiles, if they will beleeve, and ſo to have *Abraham* their Father, and their Infants father; (for ſeed includes Infants all along.)

Fifthly, that amongſt them before Chriſt, there was many had a work of the ſpirit of bondage wrought upon them, and ſome a work of the ſpirit of adoption. *Iſhmael* in an Allegory, was the type of the children of Bondage, and *Iſaac* of the children of Adoption: And ſo it is now in the times after Chriſt, there are ſome of *Iſaacs* rank, and ſome of *Iſhmaels*; there were alwayes two *Jeruſalems*,

lems; *Iſhmael* and ſuch as he was, are of the *Jeruſalem* below, *Iſaac* and ſuch as he was, are of *Jeruſalem* from above, the two mothers, or *Jeruſalems* being not two ſeverall diſpenſations of one and the ſame Covenant in a twofold Teſtament any way. No change therefore is in the promiſe in the ſtate of it, but it is the ſame from the time of revealing it, till now. And Infants all that time from *Abraham* to *Moſes*, and from *Moſes* to Chriſt, were of that ſeed, and Proſelyte Gentiles and their Infants; and ſo now Gentile Infants are of the ſeed alſo: and as Infants were then circumciſed, ſo now are they to be baptized. And thus I have done with his anſwer to my firſt Argument, the ſecond followes, thus:

If in the whole body of *Iſraelites*, as well Infants as men of yeares, were baptized with the ſame baptiſme that ours is, then Infants are now to be baptized as then they were: But in the whole body of *Iſraelites* Infants were baptized with the ſame baptiſme ſpiritually that ours is; therefore Infants are now to be baptized as then they were.

He anſwereth firſt, the Argument is a Sophiſme (that is, deceitfull) becauſe in the firſt Propoſition I leave out ſpiritually, as if I intended they were baptized corporally, as now ſince Chriſts time men are: And to help me, he frames an Argument for me, putting in materially and formally, in ſtead of ſpiritually, which he grants I uſed in the ſecond propoſition; and then he anſweres by denying the Minor, that is, that we are baptized with the ſame baptiſme materially and formally, that they were baptized with; and ſo putting in materially and formally, which was not in mine, he leaveth out ſpiritually, which was in the ſecond, and ſhould have been in the firſt propoſition, had not he that writ it, left it out: And if this be not a falſe argument, yet it is an argument of his falſe dealing. Again, granting that that and ours were the ſame materially & formally, yet hee denies that it will follow thence, that now Infants may bee baptized as they were then, no more then this will follow, *Adam* might not eate of the forbidden fruit; therfore ſome kinde of fruit is forbidden us to eate. Or this, Infants were then circumciſed: *Ergo*, Infants muſt now bee circumciſed.

Reply. Firſt, all this might have been ſpared: for I uſed ſpiritually in mine argument, and in all the diſcourſe following. And further, hee had not the writing from mee, nor written with my hand; and therefore if the word ſpiritually were left out, it

was

was not by me; and what wisdome is it, or honesty, to blame me for another mans fault? But, let this passe.

Secondly, he saith, I seeme to intend they were baptized corporally, as now we are.

Reply. Yea, doubtlesse, and so they were, having their bodies sprinkled with those signes of the spirituall things, which are signified now by these signes now instituted. And to his Argument, that ours is not the same materially with theirs, I grant it; but that theirs and ours were and are sacramentall signes of one and the same spirituall grace, I affirme: and therefore it followes, that as Infants were then baptized with the same spirituall baptisme that ours is, though they had no actuall faith: For now Infants are to be baptized with the same spirituall baptisme that theirs was: And the comparisons that he useth to weaken the consequence, are not available. For as *Adam* might not eate of the forbidden tree in the garden, no more might we, and then sinned in, and with him in his eating, and should now sinne in eating of any sacramentall Tree, if God should appoint one, and forbid us to eate of it. And as infants were then circumcised spiritually, signified by that outward signe of cutting the flesh: so now Infants are to bee circumcised spiritually by that outward signe of washing the flesh. And if our and their circumcision spiritually the same, were also materially & formally the same, I should not question the circumcising Infants now.

But secondly, he setting down my argument aright, by putting in spiritually in the first proposition, hee then denies the consequence, that is, though Infants were then baptized with the same spirituall baptisme that ours is, yet ought not Infants to bee baptized now; because that was a miraculous work of Gods providence, and no sacrament instituted by God, and called baptisme by way of comparison onely, that being as great a token of Gods love to them in Christ, as baptisme an instituted ordinance was to the *Corinthians*, summing up all in this *Enthymeme*, God did baptize spiritually the Infants of Israel, therefore we may baptize Infants materially and formally, without Gods command.

Reply. First, I grant that Gods miraculous works of providence are to be admired of us, not imitated by us.

Secondly, that every signe is not a Sacrament, though every Sacrament consists in part of something that is a signe.

Thirdly, there being many other miraculous workes of God,

and

and tokens of his favour, which the Apoſtle might have taken and applied them to the *Corinthians*, as well as theſe: if they had been no more then a work of providence, it is not for nothing that hee take theſe rather then others.

Fourthly, though the things were wonderfull workes of God, yet they were not barely ſo, but by his inſtitution ſet forth to bee Sacramentall ſignes of their putting on Chriſt, eating and drinking his body and blood, which they could not be without inſtitution, nor would or could the Apoſtle ſay, they put on Chriſt, or by theſe means, as ſignes, if they had not been inſtituted, though there be no mention of it in *Moſes* writings, it is ſomething that the Apoſtle ſaith, *They were baptized into Moſes*, which means thus much, *Moſes* was Gods inſtrument from ſome word of his made known unto him, whereby he applied theſe ſignes to them, to ſignifie theſe things. And his Syllogiſme that hee makes, is a meer Sophiſme; which (to doe as much for him as hee did for mee) I ſhall ſet down in full termes, and then mend it for him, his *Enthymeme* in an entire Syllogiſme is thus: If God by his providence did baptize the Infants of *Iſrael* ſpiritually, then may we without Gods command, baptize Infants materially and formally: But God by the work of his providence did baptize the Infants of *Iſrael*; Therefore we may, without Gods command, baptize our Infants materially and formally. And who ſees not this a meer falſe Sophiſme, ſpeaking in the firſt Propoſition of baptiſme ſpiritually, and in the ſecond of baptiſme materially and formally? To mend it for him, thus it muſt run; If God did by a work of his providence ſpiritually baptize the Infants of *Iſrael*, then wee may baptize our Infants ſpiritually without Gods command; but the firſt is true, therefore the ſecond alſo. But in this there are many faults alſo: for he ſaith God baptized them, when as the Text ſaith, *Moſes*, they were baptized into *Moſes*: Again, he compareth things together as unequall, which are equall, and ſpeaketh firſt of Baptiſme, ſo called only, and not ſo indeed, and then of Baptiſme ſo called, and ſo indeed: in all which he goeth about groſly to abuſe the Reader, and to make him think, that I had no better ground to raiſe my argument on, then what he would ſeem to hold forth; let me therefore ſet down the truth of this place in this argument. If God inſtituted thoſe works of his to be ſacramentall ſignes of the ſame ſpirituall baptiſme, that our ſignes ſignifie, and *Moſes* from Gods appointment applied,

applied, then to that body as ſuch, then as the ſame ſpirituall baptiſme were applied to Infants, as well as men of yeeres by thoſe ſignes; ſo may the ſame ſpirituall baptiſme be applied to Infants now, as well as to men of yeers by theſe ſignes.

His third anſwer is to the ſame purpoſe, where going about to ſet down the ſcope of the Apoſtle he ſummes it up in this form: If miracles (which yet were as great as ordinances) did not ſecure them, but when they ſinned they were puniſhed, then ordinances will will not ſecure you, but you ſhall be ſo puniſhed, if you ſo ſin; but miracles ever did not ſecure them, but when they ſinned they were puniſhed; *Ergo*, ordinances will not ſecure you ever.

Reply. The drift of the Apoſtle is, to deterre them from Idolatry, and other ſins, leſt they be puniſhed as their fathers were. If they object and ſay, though they were puniſhed, yet wee may hope for more grace, becauſe he hath given us two ſacraments, *Baptiſme, and the Lords Supper*, and thereby hath given us to have the Son on us, and in us, as pledges of his love and favour; the Apoſtle taketh away this pretence, by telling them, they can promiſe to themſelves no more ſecurity herein, then they might promiſe unto themſelves, becauſe they had the ſame ſigns of Gods favour ſpiritually, the ſame Sacraments by other ſigns diſpenſed, but the ſame Chriſt, and therefore you can be no more ſecure then they might be; and that theſe miraculous works were ſet apart by Gods appointment to be ſacramentall ſignes to them of the ſame thing that water, bread, and wine are now to us an evident, becauſe:

Firſt, the Apoſtles argument ſhould not be of things equall, and ſo not of force to convince the conſcience of the *Corinthians*.

Secondly, there were other works of God, that held proportion with theſe (as their paſſing through *Jordan*, their eating Quails, *&c.*) but the like is not ſaid of them by the Apoſtle, nor can be ſaid of any man.

Thirdly, theſe works of God cannot of themſelves ſignifie Chriſt, but were only as all ſuch works of providence of that nature are, demonſtrations of Gods power, preſence and goodneſſe to the people, but cannot of themſelves ſignifie ſuch a thing, but by ſome cleer appointment, no more then bread and wine could ſignifie now the body and blood of Chriſt, if they were not ſet apart for that purpoſe, by, and according to an inſtitution.

Fourthly, in going through the Sea, eating Manna, drinking of

the rock they could not put on, eat or drink Christ as they were naturall things, having no such vertu in them, either to signifie, or convey him unto them of themselves; neither was Christ bodily applied unto them: as therefore it must be sacramentally, as now in these signes we have. If any shall object, and say: first, the *Israelites* understood no such thing: secondly, they did not all eat, drink, and put on Christ: I answer:

First, that all did not understand it is like, nor now do all understand the mysteries of salvation now, but they ought to have understood them, as we ought now. *Moses*, *Aaron*, and all truly regenerate, did understand as it is now; now do the understanding, or not understanding of the things of God then, and now, alter the nature of them; but so they are of themselves, as Gods appointment makes them, whatsoever mens understandings are.

Secondly, they did not all eat, &c. I answer, they did all eat, and put on Christ sacramentally, and some of them sacramentally and really; and now all do not put on Christ, eat and drink him really, but only sacramentally; yet some did both, and the rest then did, and now do make themselves guilty of the death of Christ in unworthy receiving, and did and shall bear their judgement.

But to come to the Confuter; having shewed what the scope of the Apostle was, hee next sheweth what it was not, and that saith he, is this, the Apostle intends not to shew that the *Corinthians* should administer the Sacraments to themselves and their Infants, though they do not believe in Christ, because then God did exercise such miracles to the *Israelites*, which did not believe, which saith hee is the sequele of my argument.

Rep. First, he maketh of my argument what he pleaseth; before he said this was the sequele, that we may baptize Infants now without Gods command, as God by his providence baptized Infants then.

Secondly, the Apostles purpose is not at all to prove who are to be baptized, men or Infants, believers or unbelievers; nor did I say a word that way, and therefore he shewes himself to have but a little understanding in him, to say, that is the sequele of my argument, I brought it not to prove that the *Corinthians* might baptize themselves and their Infants, though they did not believe, but that the *Corinths*, and all Gods people may baptize their Infants, if they, and wee whose Infants they are, be Gods people; and the Antecedent, from whence he would make the sequele, is untrue, which is thus:

becauſe God did exerciſe ſuch miracles to the *Iſraelites*, who did not believe: For,

Firſt, he ſaith, they were miracles, which is true, conſidered as bare acts of God, but they were not only miracles, they were ſacramental ordinances alſo, as is evident by the Text, and what I ſaid before.

Secondly, hee ſaith, they did not believe, whereas the Scripture ſaith, With many of them God was not well pleaſed; ſome therefore did believe, yea, the whole body were Gods people, and therefore were not unbelievers, in a proper ſenſe, though they did not ſo believe as they ought: and *Pſal.* 106, 12. They believed his Word, and ſang his praiſes; yea, thoſe, they preſently are ſaid, they forgat his works, and waited not for his counſell. But it ſeems he little regarded what he ſaid, for he ſaid any thing; let all now conſider, that my conſequence was this: That viſible believers, may now baptize their Infants with theſe ſignes of ſpirituall baptiſme, and following from this Antecedent, becauſe believing *Iſraelites* Infants were baptized with thoſe ſignes of the ſame ſpirituall baptiſme; yet he goeth about to prove, that that he ſaid was the ſequele of my Argument, from my proofs added; the firſt whereof is this: the other ordinances there mentioned, are the ſame ſpiritually with ours; *Ergo*, this of baptiſme was the ſame ſpiritually with ours, (this I ſaid, becauſe the Apoſtle doth not admit ſpiritually the ſame with ours, as he ſaid of the other) my proof is of this, that that baptizing and ours is the ſame ſpiritually, and not of this, that the *Corinths* may baptize themſelves and theirs, though neither do believe; and therefore this was not my ſequele, that he ſaith, but it may be his anſwers will make it good. And,

Firſt, he ſaith, that by conſequence belike the *Corinths* muſt baptize themſelves and their Infants, though neither of them do believe, becauſe God did baptize them with the ſame ſpirituall baptiſme that ours is, though they did not believe, the which thus laid open, he hopes I will not affirm.

Reply. This is the ſame with the former, and therefore is anſwered fully; that the *Corinths* did believe, that the *Iſraelites* did believe; and doth this ſenſe convince that to be my ſequele, which he ſaid by my proof? I hope all will ſee, that I might juſtly ſay, the believing *Corinths* might baptize their Infants, becauſe the *Iſraelites* baptized theirs, with the ſame ſpirituall baptiſme that ours is, and ſhall hold it ſtill, for any thing hee ſaith to the contrary; yet not truſting to this he gives another anſwer.

Secondly, saith he, you erre in calling there the other ordinances, whereas they are the other miracles, and concludes, that if I had well weighed the Scripture, I would not have made it a ground to justifie Infants baptisme.

Reply. And what is this to that he should prove; namely, my proof evinceth that to be my sequele, which hee said was my proof was not, who was to be baptized, but that all the ordinances there mentioned were the same with our baptisme, as well as the rest.

Again, where he saith, they were the other miracles, and not the other ordinances, and that I erre in calling them so.

I reply, it is too much bodlnesse in him to prescribe how others shall speak, and hee erres grosly, in saying as he doth; for if that shewed that these miracles were ordinances also; *Ergo*, may be so called: for could these miraculous works signifie such things, unlesse they had been ordained thereto? and whatsoever is ordained is an ordinance. In a word, I have upon his expression better viewed this place then ever I did, and doubt not, but every one that shall weigh how ill hee confutes it, will see that there is a just ground in it to defend the baptisme of Infants, which is the question.

A fourth answer he gives to my Argument is this: If the *Israelites* were not baptized with these signes, nor with any other after they came into the land of *Canaan*, then this was not a perpetuall signe of the practice of baptisme, but they were not baptized with these signes, nor any other after they came into the land of *Canaan*; therefore it was not a perpetuall sign of the practice of baptisme.

Reply. First, it is the minde of the that they had another baptisme continued unto them: And *Hebrew* Writers affirm, that three things concurred to make a *Jew*, or *Proselyte* male a stated member, circumcision, baptisme, and sacrifice; and to females, baptisme and sacrifice. And some conclude from hence, that the *Jewes* therefore questioned *John Baptist*, calling to baptize, but not his baptisme, being used to it before; but to passe that.

2ly, What time will he prescribe to make an example sufficient? it must have a period, and why may not a moneth serve as wel as a longer time, and those forty yeers in the wildernes as wel as a thousand?

3ly, How many things in the Scripture are recorded, done in a short time, which were examples of things done in a longer time? *Eze.* 4. 5, 6. the acts of *Abrahams* justification by faith, *Gen.* 15. 6. an example of perpetuall justification, *Rom.* 4. 24. *Jude* 7. the instances in the Scripture,

Scripture, 1 *Cor.* 10. & many others; ſo that this anſwer is of no force.

The fifth and laſt anſwer is this, Baptiſme of different kindes depend upon different grounds, and are to be miniſtred upon different ſubjects to different ends: but the baptiſme of the cloud and Sea are of divers kindes, therefore they depend upon different grounds, and are to be adminiſtred upon different ſubjects for different ends.

Reply. I ſhall ſay no more but this; baptiſmes of the ſame kinde depend upon the ſame grounds, and are to be adminiſtred upon the ſame ſubjects to the ſame ends; but baptiſme of the Sea and cloud is the ſame ſpiritually with ours, therefore they depend upon the ſame grounds (divine inſtitution) and to be adminiſtred upon the ſame ſubjects, (Gods people, men and Infants) and to the ſame ends (to put on Chriſt Jeſus). Another proof I added to my Argument was this, otherwiſe the Apoſtle ſhould link things together that are not equall; nor would it be of force againſt the *Corinthians*, if they were not the ſame Sacraments ſpiritually: now the concluſion is certain, that the *Corinthians* ſhould be puniſhed with like puniſhment, if they committed the like ſins. His anſwer hereunto denies the conſequence, becauſe although the Cloud, and Sea, Manna, and Rock, were Sacraments of the ſame Chriſt, that Baptiſme and the Lords Supper is, yet they were not the ſame Sacraments; and it ſufficeth the Apoſtles purpoſe, that the cloud, &c. were as effectuall tokens of Chriſt (as they were in the nature of them) as Baptiſme and the Lords Supper is, though they were different Sacraments of the ſame Chriſt, and not the ſame Sacrament. And except they were dipped in water, did eat and drink bread and wine, as we do, I cannot ſay they were the ſame Sacraments w^th^ ours.

Reply. Firſt, hee ſhould ſay ſacramentall ſignes, and not Sacraments; for neither the ſeal nor bread and wine are the Sacraments, but ſacramentall ſignes, the things ſignified, concurring to make them ſacraments; nor can any be guilty of the body of the Lord in eating the bread, if that alone were the Sacrament.

Secondly, it is true, that the ſacramentall ſignes then and now were not the ſame, and in that regard the Sacraments are not the ſame, but to ſay abſolutely they are not the ſame therefore, is not right: For a man, though dreſſed in never ſo many faſhions differing one from another, yet he is the ſame man ſtill, although his faſhions differ; and in that reſpect he is not the ſame, yet the man is the ſame in all: So Chriſt is the ſame yeſterday and to-day, and for ever,

ever, though set forth by divers signes then and now, 1 *Cor.* 5. 7. Christ our Passeover is offered for us, he is the Lamb slain from the beginning of the world, their Lamb and ours, their Passeover and ours, theirs and ours dispensed the same, but not by the same signs; and therefore to what subjects the same Christ was applied then by those signes, to such subjects may the same Christ be applied now by these signes; but I have spoken to these things before: now is my Argument refuted by any thing he hath said?

My third Argument follows, which is this; there is one and the same consideration of the root and branches, of the first fruits and lump: but the first fruits and root believing parents are holy, and must be baptized, therefore Infants the lump and branches are holy, and must be baptized.

To this he answereth, denying the Assumption, *viz.* believing Parents are the roots and first fruits, and the Scriptures that I bring will not prove it: *Rom.* 11. 16. 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. which hee considering apart; and,

First, *Rom.* 11. 16. concludeth, that parents are not the root, because they are branches of the root, they bear not the root, but the them; therefore they cannot be this root, nor their children naturally descending from them branches, and concludeth this first place to be abused in so applying it.

Reply. Grant that believing parents are branches, and not the root; yet Infants as well as men of yeers are branches, and *Abraham*, and the Fathers are the root, and that of the *Gentiles*, as well as the *Jews*, 1 *Cor.* 10. 1. Now the Argument holdeth as well here in this respect as in the other: For, if *Abraham* the root be holy, so are the branches; as is the state of the one, so is the state of the other; and this the Apostle concludes of all the body of *Jewes*, (yea, counting them are cut off naturall branches still) and let believing *Gentiles* be counted branches, yet Infants then were some of the branches, when they were in the Olive, or root, and so were branches cut off when their parents were cut off; as long as the parents stood branches, so long the Infants were branches; nor were any parents branches but from that state they had when Infants; *Gentiles* Infants therefore are branches with their believing parents, and stand in the same state with them.

Secondly, wee know that the Scriptures do not so appropriate the words, root, and first fruits, as not to apply them to others, besides

sides the particulars: *Jerem.* 11. 16. God called the *Church* there an *Olive*, and the people *branches*; so she is called a *Vine*, *Isa.* 5, &c. So others are called first fruits: as, 1 *Cor.* 16. 15. *Rev.* 14. 4, *&c.* And if parents had no relation to children, nor Infants to parents in this respect, how could Infants, being branches with their parents to *Abraham* the root, be cut off with their parents, seeing they could not be cut off for their own unbeliefe? and their relation to *Abraham* was intire, in respect of any thing on their part to the contrary. This place therefore is not abused in the application of it, but fully concludeth what I brought it for.

Next hee considereth, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. which hee saith, neither suppresseth roots nor first fruits; nor hath it any such meaning, as that the holinesse of the parent should cause a holinesse in their Infant.

In a word, I reply, root and first fruits are not expressed, but necessarily implyed; and so much is expressed as amounts to that: For, if the children be holy upon their parents believing, and if the parents did not believe, the children should not be holy, it is as much as if he had said, the root is holy, and the branches are holy, not in the parents believing, any cause of their childrens holinesse, but Gods free grace. But not to strive about words, in the view of the place it self, before he comes to expresse his Reasons, negative and affirmative, he conceives it necessary to observe what I say, which hee thus sets down:

I suppose it is mistaken, when expounded of the same holinesse, spoken of before, of an Infidel person, sanctified to a believing yoke-fellow. And the Apostle speaking of a two-fold holinesse, the one not in the thing it self, but to another use; the other of the thing it self, it cannot but be sinfull to confound them: Hee answereth, hee will not contend, nor gain-say any thing of this.

Reply. Herein he makes himself an Adversary to some of his judgment in this case of Baptisme, who maintain that state of holiness to be meant in the children, that was in the parent, that is holy to the believers use. Further, he saith, I say the Apostle saith two things; *that to the pure all things are pure*; *Ergo*, a believing person may dwell with an Infidell yoke-fellow.

Secondly, that by vertue of a believers state in grace, all the fruit is holy, and partakers of the same state in grace, unlesse they do by some act of theirs deprive themselves of it, as *Esau* and *Ishmael*, &c.

In answer to this he grants the former, but denies the latter wholly,

ly, and that it is not the purpoſe of *Paul* ſo to ſpeak, and therefore he gives divers reaſons.

¶ 1. Firſt, the Apoſtle intends ſuch a holineſſe in the Infants, as is inſeparable from their very being; or elſe it would not have been a ſufficient proof of the ſanctification of the unbelieving unto the believer.

Reply. I deny that the Apoſtle intends to conclude ſuch a holineſſe as is inſeparable to their very being; for then it would be common to all Infants, whereas this is appropriated to an Infant of at leaſt one believer. In a word, there is a two-fold holineſſe of a perſon: one is externall, and is the ſeparation of him from common ſtate to be the Lords, and bound up in covenant with him, which is fœderall holineſſe. The other is internall, and is the ſpeciall ſeparation of a man from the ſtate of ſin, by inherent ſanctificaon from juſtification in Chriſt, which is inſeparable from them that have it: The other is ſeparable, as in the caſe of *Jewes*, who by this were called a holy people, when yet they were not really ſanctified by inherent grace, and the holy city called an Harlot; and of this in his place, which fully will prove what the Apoſtle intends, as wee ſhall ſee afterward; His ſecond Reaſon follows, which is this:

¶ 2. If by a believers ſtate in grace be meant the covenant that *Abraham* and all believers do poſſeſſe by faith, then he ſaith, firſt *Iſhmael*, *Eſau*, &c. were never of it, *Rom.* 9. 8. and therefore could not by any act of theirs deprive themſelves of it.

Reply. Firſt, by the ſtate of grace is meant that covenant that *Abraham* and all believers do poſſeſſe by faith.

Secondly, I ſay *Iſhmael*, *Eſau*, &c. were of that covenant diſpenſed on Gods part unto them, and to be received on their part by faith at preſent or afterward. And if *Iſhmael* and *Eſau* were not ſo in that covenant, as well as *Iſaac* and *Jacob*, then how could they be circumciſed with the ſeal of the righteouſneſſe of faith? they had the ſame ſeal ſet unto them that *Abraham*, *Iſaac* and *Jacob* had, and if it were not the ſame covenant, then *Abraham*, *Iſaac* and *Jacob* were in one covenant, and ſealed to that; and *Iſhmael* and *Eſau*, and the like, were in another covenant, and ſealed to that, with the ſame ſeal that the others were ſealed to the other.

Further, whether or no ſhall *Iſhmael*, *Eſau*, &c. be judged according to that covenant of *Abraham*, and puniſhed for refuſing it? if ſo, (as it is certain) then they were under that covenant, though they

they injoyed not the benefit of it, which is the meaning of *Rom.*9. 8. and deprived themſelves of it by hardening their hearts, and had a ſpirit of ſlumber inflicted upon them, as a juſt puniſhment of that their refuſing, *Rom.* 11. 7.

Secondly, he ſaith, that if *Iſhmael* and *Eſau* were deprived by ſome act of theirs, then we muſt fall upon *Arminius* tenet of falling from grace, which all underſtanding Chriſtians do utterly abhor.

Reply. Firſt, it is well known, that many holding with the Confuter, in this point of *pædobaptiſme*, do maintain that a man truly elected, and in ſtate of ſalvation, may, and do fall away and periſh; if he diſſents in this, I will not blame him.

2ly, What underſtanding Chriſtian did ever deny that ſome men fall from grace? and are there not many Scriptures that do teſtifie as much? Chriſtians do deny, that any elect of God, and made partakers of ſaving calling, can fall away from that eſtate, they thereby are made partakers of. But there is another ſtate of grace, whereof many non-elected are partakers of, by the covenant on Gods part diſpenſed, and of many effects of Gods operation in their hearts, ſome more, ſome leſſe, and from this all of them may, many of them do fall away, the Scriptures affirming, no underſtanding Chriſtian denying it, *Heb.*6. 4, &c.

3ly, He anſwereth, then the being under the everlaſting covenant of grace and peace with God by Chriſt ſhould be conveyed by naturall deſcent, and not by the Goſpel, which is abſurd, and contrary to many Scriptures; *Rom.* 1. 16, 17. and 10. 17. *Gal.* 3. 2. 2 *Joh.*3. 5, *&c.* Theſe Scriptures, ſaith he, ſhews: firſt, that the Goſpel is the power of God, to ſave every one that believeth: Secondly, that faith cometh by hearing the Word preached, by which converſion is wrought, whereby wee become ſons of God by adoption and grace. But the Poſition ſaith, that ſome are partakers thereof, by vertue of their parents by generation, directly contrary, yea, to the whole Goſpel of Chriſt, *Rom.* 4. 14. where, if they of the Law (naturally deſcended and circumciſed only) be heirs, the promiſe (the whole Goſpel and covenant of grace) is made of none effect.

Reply. Firſt, they were all under the everlaſting covenant of Gods grace, equally on Gods part diſpenſed, offering unto them thereby all the Goſpel to peace and life.

Secondly, this offer was not made unto them for any naturall reſpect, but freely of Gods grace. The naturall generation (though

many *Gentiles* alſo) were taken into covenant, and had the grace thereof offered unto them, and to be beſtowed upon them, but not out of any reſpect to them, (naturall, civill, or religious, *Deut.* 17. 7, 8. & 9. 5.) but meerely out of his good will and faithfulneſſe.

Thirdly, the Goſpel was preached unto all the poſterity of *Abraham*, all along to Chriſt, and his time, by himſelf and Apoſtles, preaching no other thing then *Moſes* and the Prophets had preached before them, to all that then believed, it was the power of God to ſave them, *Act.* 15. 11. all ought to have believed it, and if they had, it would have been the power of God to their ſalvation alſo; and they that did not believe, it was not the power of God to their ſalvation, becauſe they believed not, *Heb.* 4. 12. and it was their ſin, and will be to their puniſhment. Now it is the power of God, not to ſalvation of all (though Church-members) to whom it is preached, but many came ſhort through unbeliefe. All the Scriptures therefore by him alledged, are hereby anſwered; nor is there any footing for his diſtinction, in regard of Gods part diſpenſing, but from them who received not what God offered, but refuſed it. Hee proceedeth thus: If by grace I mean that favour of God, whereby hee made the *Jewes* partakers of circumciſion and ordinances, as the fleſhly ſeed of *Abraham*, leading them to Chriſt above other nations, then he grants that *Iſhmael*, and ſuch were partakers of that grace.

Reply. Firſt, this is not all they were partakers of, but of the former alſo, and of this from the former; nor were they partakers of this, or any thing elſe, as they were *Abrahams* ſeed barely, but from his grace to their fathers, and therein taking them above others to be his peculiar people. Secondly, they were partakers of theſe ordinances as leading to Chriſt, therefore not of ordinances barely, but Chriſt offered unto them by theſe ordinances, and of theſe ordinances for Chriſts ſake given unto them. I would ask whether they were to believe in Chriſt or no, and ſo to be ſaved? If ſo (as certain it is) how then can he make good this diſtinction, or deny that they were under the everlaſting covenant of Gods grace, and by theſe ordinances to be partakers of? But granting this unto them, hee ſaith, But this was taken away when Chriſt came; all which I have ſpoken to before, more then once.

Secondly, he ſaith, that the Apoſtles purpoſe is not to conclude thoſe children ſpoken of, 1 *Cor.* 7. within the limits of ſuch a diſtinction, becauſe the Lord there in that ſtate did count children borne

borne of one believer, unclean and polluted, and to be put away with their mothers, being Infidels, *Ezra* 9.2. and 11.3. Therefore that ſtate, even while it laſted, did not allow children to be of that ſtate, when one of the parents were forreiner to the Church, much leſſe hath it any force now to conclude it ſhould be ſo, when that the ſtate it ſelf is diſanulled.

Reply. Firſt, it is the Apoſtles meaning to conclude ſuch Infants under the covenant with their believing parents, whereby they were fœderally holy; nor can there be any other holineſſe here intended, as we ſhal ſee afterward. And the reaſon which he giveth to diſprove it, is not ſufficient, becauſe it is of an inſtance of a diverſe nature from this of the Apoſtle, 1 *Cor.*7. though he would confound them, whether willingly or no, I leave others to judge. His Reaſon is this: That ſtate did not allow of children born of one believing parent, but accounted them unclean, and required them to be put away with their mother.

Reply. That of *Ezra* ſpeaketh of a believing *Jew*, married to an Infidel *Heathen*; this of the Apoſtle ſpeaketh not of a believing *Chriſtian*, marrying an Infidell, but of one who being married, when they were both Infidels, the one being converted after marriage, the other remaining unconverted. That in *Ezra* was an unlawfull marriage firſt or laſt, this in *Corinth* was a lawfull marriage: Secondly, that in *Ezra* therefore being unlawfull, was not to be continued, but the wife and children to be put away; but this in *Corinth* is not ſo; the Infidel here may be continued, if contented to dwell with the believer, nor are the children unclean; but both the inſtances being of two caſes ſo different, thence is no ground for this reaſon, and ſo that hee grounded on that reaſon falls with it.

¶ 3. A third Reaſon that he gives againſt that I ſaid, that the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of a holineſſe, which the Infants of a believer hath with their believing Parent, ſtanding under the ſame ſtate of grace, is this:

Firſt, that a Proſelyte in the time of the Law, by circumciſion was made a member of the *Jewiſh* ſtate, as one born in the land.

Secondly, hee was to circumciſe all his males, and thereby they were admitted, and with the males, wife, females, children; (there being no other Sacrament of entrance for them) and unleſſe he did circumciſe himſelf and all his males, though neither hee nor they believed, hee could not be a member of that ſtate.

Thirdly, no preſident can be, that ever one parent coming to be

of the *Jewiſh* ſtate, and leave their married yoke-mates out, did poſſeſſe their ſeed of the ſame ſtate; and therefore now in this ſtate, whereof men are partakers by faith only (and thereupon a believer admitted, and the unbelieving yoke-mate left out) the Infants cannot be admitted into this ſtate, no more then the wife, which in that ſtate was brought in, by the care of the husband being a proſelyte, and in this left out till ſhee believed.

Reply. Firſt, a proſelyte was not made a member of the *Jewiſh* Church by circumciſion, but by accepting the God of *Iſrael* to be his God, and ſubmitting himſelf to their lawes, receiving circumciſion as a ſeal thereof, that being not the firſt, but a ſecond grace, not the covenant it ſelf, but the ſign of the covenant.

Secondly, I deny that all the males were to be circumciſed, or elſe their parents might not be admitted; but only Infants were admitted and circumciſed with the parent, and thoſe of yeers were not admitted and circumciſed, but upon their owne voluntary acceptance of, and ſubmitting to the covenant, and ſo the believing proſelytes yoke-fellow: For, if they had no faith, though they had circumciſion, yet how could they partake in the Paſſeover, or ſacrifices to the remiſſion of ſin? And therefore, though there were no Sacrament for females entrance, yet there muſt be faith, either potentially by being under the covenant with their believing parent, or actually by their own profeſſion. And (as I have anſwered before to the like allegation) they ſhould receive the ſeal of the covenant (which in order of nature followes it) and were not in it, and be admitted to circumciſion, the ſeal of the righteouſneſſe of faith, which they had not.

Thirdly, touching a preſident or rule of a believing proſelyte, admitted with his Infants, leaving out the yoke-fellow, I need ſay no more then this: *Whatſoever is not of faith, is,* and ever was, *ſin, Rom.* 14. *ult.* and, *without faith it is impoſſible* (and ever was) *to pleaſe God,* Heb. 11. 6. But this anſwer ſaith, that a proſelyte might be admitted and circumciſed with all his males and females, by vertue of his admiſſion, though neither hee nor they believed, quite contrary to theſe Scriptures; and ſo ſome ſhould become one with *Abrahams* people, neither by fleſh nor faith, which himſelf hath ſaid are the only two wayes, whereby any may be inſtated in ſuch a condition. As therefore in that ſtate proſelytes were admitted by faith into the fellowſhip thereof, and therein Infants with them, by vertue

tue of Gods covenant, accepted for themſelves and their ſeed, but thoſe of yeers, and their yoke-fellows excluded, unleſſe they did believe: So in this ſtate now, a believer and his Infants are admitted into fellowſhip of it; but ſuch children as are of yeers and unbelieving yoke-fellow excluded, till they believe.

A 4th reaſon of this is this: The Apoſtle ſpeaks indefinitly of children as children, and in that relation to parents, whoſe children they are, whereof ſome of them might be twenty or thirty yeers old, but children of twenty or thirty yeers old, apparently wicked, are not holy in ſuch a ſenſe, as by vertue of their parents ſtate in grace, to be partakers of the ſame ſtate with them, and for that cauſe to be baptized. Therfore holines here cannot be ſo underſtood by the Apoſtle. ¶ 4.

Reply. Firſt, the Apoſtle ſpeaking indefinitely; I grant children of any or no yeers may be underſtood.

Secondly, children of twenty or thirty yeers, or Infants have a ſtate of holineſſe upon them by vertue (not of naturall relation, but) of fœderall, as children of a believer; for that muſt be noted, that one of them muſt be a believer, that being the caſe, that the Apoſtle reſolveth.

Thirdly, children of twenty yeers more apparently wicked, were born either before the parent believed, or after; if after, then they are holy ſeep, a ſeed of a believer, and ſo remain, notwithſtanding their wickedneſſe, till they be cut off from that relation by God, in his uſuall way, and then that holineſſe is taken away from them, their naturall relation ſtil continuing, they are children ſtil of thoſe parents, whoſe they were; if they were born before, I ſay then they are unclean, notwithſtanding their parents believing, and are not holy at all, nor can be partakers of it, but by their own faith in Gods covenant: but for Infants, as I ſaid before, they are holy, and by vertue thereof may be baptized as a holy ſeed, and ſo remain, till by ſome act of theirs they be cut off, and deprive themſelves of it, as *Iſhmael* and *Eſau*. This exception hee excepted againſt, ſaying, the Apoſtle ſpeaketh poſitively, of a concluſion drawn from the ſtate of the relation, which can admit of no exception: For, if it could, then will it be of no abſolute validity to enforce the concluſion. Again, if the children do deprive themſelves by ſome act of theirs, of their ſtate in grace, then their believing parents can have no ſanctified uſe of the believing yoke-mate; but that may be, whether the children be in the ſtate of grace or no.

Reply.

Reply. Firſt, the Apoſtle ſpeaks poſitively of a concluſion, drawn from the ſtate of the relation, that is not naturall, as children, but fœderall, as holy children of a believing parent.

Secondly, it may, and doth admit of an exception, and yet is of abſolute validity, to enforce the concluſion, becauſe the exception lies in a diverſe reſpect of the thing; if it lay againſt the thing it ſelf, *viz.* as a believers childe, then indeed it would not force; but it lies here, that when it comes to yeers, and ſtands by its own faith, in regard of perſonall relation acted to the covenant, alſo by perſonall ſin, deprive it ſelf of the perſonall ſtate it had by perſonall relation to the covenant; yet, though the children ceaſe to be, and deprive themſelves of that fœderall holineſſe, which they had in regard of their perſonall, the relation they had of children of believers, and thereby holy, remains ſtill; they were holy as born of them, as is evident in the *Jewiſh* Infants, cut off with their parents, who were a holy ſeed, before they were cut off. But more of this afterward.

¶ 5. The fifth anſwer he makes, ſtands thus, The holineſſe here ſpoken of is ſuch as muſt prove the unbeleeving parent ſanctified to the beleeving yoak-mate. But the holineſſe of Infants in ſuch a ſtate of grace inward or outward, will not prove an unbeleeving parent to be ſanctified to the beleeving yoak-mate, therefore it cannot bee meant of ſuch a holineſſe; and hee gives this Reaſon of this Aſſumption, Becauſe it anſwers not the *Corinthians* ſcruple, nor proves the thing in queſtion by them.

Reply. To cleer this diſcourſe, two things are to be attended: Firſt, what was the *Corinthians* ſcruple, and the ſtate of the queſtion amongſt them: Secondly, by what argument the Apoſtle anſwers this ſcruple and queſtion.

To the firſt, hee ſaith: The ſcruple that troubled the Church, was, whether their marriage were lawfull or no, and ſheweth that ſuch a ſtate of holineſſe of Infants in grace, whether inward or outward, will not prove whether the parents were lawfully married or no, becauſe the childrens ſtate in grace cannot prove the unbelieving parent ſanctified to the believing yoke-fellow.

Reply. Firſt, Grant the holineſſe here ſpoken of, muſt be ſuch as muſt prove the unbelieving parent to be ſanctified to the believing yoke-fellow, yet to argue that ſuch a holineſſe of children in a ſtate of grace will not prove that, is but a miſtake: For, if the children

be

be holy, then certainly the believing parents from whom they proceed, must needs be holy: For no man can bring that which is clean out of that which is unclean; a Thorn brings not forth Figs, nor a Fig-tree bramble-buries; a Turk bears not a Christian, nor a Christian a Turk; *Ergo*, if children be holy, the unbelieving parent is sanctified to the believing yoke-mate; so that they may enjoy society one with another, otherwise children born of them could not be holy. In a word, the scruple of the *Corinthians* was not whether the marriage was lawfull or no, but whether a believer might continue to cohabite and enjoy marriage society with an Infidel yoke-fellow, and not be polluted. This was the case that troubled the *Corinthians*, and not whether their marriage were lawfull or no; and there is a great difference between a lawfull marriage and a holy pure marriage; the marriage may be lawfull, but not pure; To the impure all things are impure, but not unlawfull. And their marriage being made when they were both unbelievers, how can they question it now? but they must question whether there was any marriage in the world ever lawfull, unlesse they were both believers.

Secondly, the Arguments the Apostle gives, will none of them prove that the question was of the lawfulnesse of the marriage.

For first he saith, the unbeleeving is sanctified to the beleeving, doth this prove the marriage lawfull? No, certainly, marriage of unbeleevers is lawfull, yea altogether as lawfull as marriage of beleevers, but their marriage is not so pure as of beleevers. For a lawfull marriage doth not sanctifie unbeleevers one unto the other, nor doth it sanctifie beleevers one to another: for then it would sanctifie unbeleevers also, but it doth not, but their marriage remaineth impure, though never so lawfull, onely beleeving makes all things pure, and so marriage unto them that beleeve, but not more lawfull.

A second Argument of the Apostle is from hope of gaining the unbeleeving party. Now what argument is in this to prove that their marriage was lawfull, and that was their scruple?

Thirdly, the Apostle would have every one to abide in his calling and state wherein God called him to faith, and how will this prove the marriage lawfull? or how if the marriage had been unlawful? Not a word of all these arguments will prove that he said to be the question, nor give any satisfaction unto it, if it should bee the question. But this was the question, Whether they might continue

tinue in their lawfull married estate, and not be polluted from the Infidell party. This is cleare in the Text, the arguments prove it to be the question, and fully satisfieth the scruple.

¶ 6. His sixth answer therefore concluding the holinesse here spoken of, is meant of legitimacy and uncleanness of bastardy, is evacuated. For what force is in this holinesse, to prove the thing it is brought for by the Apostle for to invert his Argument? This hee granteth: Such a holinesse must be here meant, as must prove an unbeleeving parent to be sanctified to the beleeving yoak-fellow. But this holinesse of legitimacy cannot prove the unbeleeving parent to bee sanctified to the beleeving yoak-fellow: therefore legitimacy cannot bee meant. For two unbeleevers may be in a lawfull marriage estate, and have children legitimate and not bastards, yet for all this they are not sanctified each to other, all things being impure to the impure. Whereas he saith, it must bee such a holinesse as is derived from all parents lawfully married, which legitimacy is, but the other holinesse stood for, is not.

Reply. I deny it, but it must be such a holinesse as is derived onely from parents, whereof one at least is a beleever: now legitimacie is not such a holinesse as is derived onely from parents whereof one at least is a beleever. But the other is such a holinesse. But saith he, it must be meant of such a holinesse as is derived from all parents lawfully married. Because the Argument standeth in the children which were born before one of the parents came to the faith, which therefore could receive from them unbeleeving, no other holinesse but legitimacie in the course of generation.

Reply. This holinesse here comes not by generation, though concurring with it, but flowes from the parents state of being in grace.

Secondly, the Argument standeth not in regard of the children born before one was a believer, but of those after, as is clear from the Text: For a believing person sanctifieth the unbelieving party, else the children (not born before either believed) but born of a believer and an Infidell were unclean, but now they are holy, born of a believing and Infidel parent; and therefore legitimacie cannot be meant here by holinesse, because it is not necessary to make a childe legitimate, that one of the parents be a believer. It must be such a holinesse of children, as is proper to children of believers, at least one of them; and this may also answer what hee further addeth, that taking holinesse for legitimacie, there can be no objection made

why

why legitimacie ſhould not prove the unbelieving yoke-fellow to be ſanctified to the believing parent. To which I adde this further, that legitimacie will not prove that, becauſe legitimacie may be, and is in the children of both parents, unbelieving, and lawfully married; and yet it will not prove that they are ſanctified one to another, there being as much legitimacie in Infidels children as in Believers, unleſſe he will conclude, that ſuch marriages of Infidels are lawfull, and all their children baſtards; legitimacie cannot be underſtood therefore here by holineſſe, but fœderall holineſſe: (as ſhall be further cleered afterwards) and thus his refutation of my third argument is cleered to be of no validity, I hope fully.

My fourth Argument hee thus ſets down: If baptiſme ſucceed circumciſion, then as Infants were circumciſed, ſo Infants muſt be baptized: But baptiſme ſucceeds circumciſion; *Ergo*, as Infants were circumciſed, ſo Infants muſt be baptized. To this hee gives foure anſwers: Denying the conſequence, that is, that though baptiſme ſucceed circumciſion in a ſenſe, that therefore the ſame ſubjects are to be baptized now, that were to be circumciſed then.

In his firſt anſwer, hee giveth divers inſtances, to ſhew the weakneſſe of the conſequence in this, by the inconſequences in them, as the Goſpel ſucceeds the Law. The ſons of *Aaron* were Miniſters of the Law; *Ergo*, they are to be Miniſters of the Goſpel: Baptiſme ſucceeds circumciſion; grown males, though they had no faith, were circumciſed; *Ergo*, males now having no faith muſt be baptized; females were not circumciſed; *Ergo*, females muſt not be baptized. The Lords Supper ſucceeds the Paſſeover, their little children eat it with the reſt of the family in one houſe; *Ergo*, Infants may now eat the Lords Supper, now with the reſt of the family in one houſe. And he asks if this be good reaſon? and concludes, that no objection can lie againſt theſe, but will lie againſt mine alſo.

Reply. Firſt, hee ſaith baptiſme ſucceeds circumciſion in a ſenſe, but ſetteth not down what ſenſe it is that hee meaneth, which had been neceſſary. For things ſucceed one another many wayes, and there is not the ſame conſideration of all things that ſucceed one another. The ſenſe that I intended it in is this, That baptiſme ſucceeds circumciſion by Gods inſtitution, as a ſigne of Gods covenant, and a ſeal of the righteouſneſſe of faith, held forth in the covenant; and if baptiſme ſucceeds circumciſion in this ſenſe, (as it doth) then neceſſarily followeth; that look who were ſubjects of

the covenant then, and received the ſeal of it, under thoſe ſignes adminiſtred, the ſame ſubjects are now in the covenant, and are to receive the ſeal of it under theſe ſigns adminiſtred: unleſſe therefore it can be proved, that God by ſome manifeſt word, hath excluded Infants now; the conſequence cannot be denied, and the argument fully concluded.

Secondly, the inſtance that he brings to ſhew the inconſequence of this, by the inconſequence of them, are not paralleled and ſubject to exceptions that this will not admit of: As firſt the Goſpel ſucceeds the Law, therefore *Aarons* ſons are to be Miniſters of the Goſpel as they were then of the Law.

Reply. This compariſons ſuits not, the Law and the Goſpel ſucceed one another not as circumciſion and baptiſme; nor will it follow, becauſe baptiſme ſucceeded circumciſion, therefore Infants are to be baptized as they were circumciſed, ſo the Goſpel ſucceeds the Law; *Ergo*, *Aarons* ſons are to ſucceed themſelves under the Goſpel: For I do not ſay cirumciſion ſucceeds circumciſion; but thus it will follow: As then there were ſacrifices and ſervices, and none but *Aarons* ſons might not adminiſter; ſo now, no man muſt adminiſter theſe ſervices appointed, but ſuch as are called, as *Aaron* was. His ſecond, that circumciſion was adminiſtred to grown males that had no faith, is falſe, as I have ſhewne before, more then once, nor were females excluded then from circumciſion, no more then they were excluded from the covenant, but ſhould have been circumciſed, if they had been capable, as the males; that females had the inward circumciſion, cannot be denied; and whether they had not ſomething analogicall to the outward, may be queſtioned, although it be not expreſſed: Laſt of all, it is true, that the Lords Supper ſucceeds the Paſſeover, but that all Infants did eat the Paſſeover with the reſt, will be denied, many being not naturally capable, by reaſon of age, and none but ſuch as were able to underſtand the nature of the ordinance might partake of it, (as now none but ſuch may partake in the Lords Supper) and therefore they were required to inſtruct their children in the nature and uſe of the ordinance; and although every family were to eat a Lamb together in a houſe, yet after they were ſetled in the Land, they were to eat it at *Jeruſalem*, and it was to be killed at the Tabernacle firſt, *Deut.* 16. 6, 7. Nor was every family bound to eat it alone; if they were too many, or too few, they were to have ſo many, and no more, nor

might

might any uncircumciſed, or unclean, or apoſtate eat thereof, (and females might, although not circumciſed) for there are many objections to be made againſt theſe inſtances, that cannot lie againſt the conſequence of my Propoſition.

A ſecond anſwer hee gives is this: The body of the *Jewes* were ſubjects of circumciſion, according to the Law, even when Chriſt dyed, yet the ſame were not ſubjects of baptiſme, according to the Goſpel, till they gladly received the Word, *Acts* 2. 4.

Reply. Firſt, they were not circumciſed before, but as they gladly received the Word, and thereupon circumciſed, and their Infants with them, by vertue of Gods promiſe.

Secondly, it is true, no *Jewes* of yeeres were baptized till they received the Word, but that was not becauſe any might be circumciſed before without receiving the Word, but becauſe of the change of the manner of adminſtration of one and the ſame word in a different manner; as the parents receiving the Word under that diſpenſation they were circumciſed, and their Infants with them; ſo now parents receiving the Word, are to be baptized, and their Infants with them.

His third anſwer is this; as baptiſme ſucceeds circumciſion, ſo the command and ſubject of baptiſme ſucceeds the ſubject and command of circumciſion: the command of circumciſion was of males only, and that on the eighth day; the Proſelyte muſt circumciſe all his males, although they have no faith, the females muſt not be circumciſed, although they have never ſo much faith; but the commandment of baptiſme is only of Diſciples, men and women, a deſcription of whom yee may ſee, *Luke* 14. 26. 27. 33 therefore the conſequence followeth not.

Reply. Firſt, it is the command of God that ſanctifieth circumciſion and baptiſme in their ſeverall times to be adminiſtred.

Secondly, Gods command muſt ſanctifie the ſubjects to whom they are to be adminiſtred; and therefore to circumciſe any then, or baptize any now, but ſuch as God commands, is a ſinfull error.

Thirdly, it is not the command of circumciſing why wee baptize any, but a command of baptizing them, why they are baptized; and therefore the commandment of baptizing being not to baptize at any ſet time, wee do not baptize any on the eighth day as they circumciſed; wee likewiſe baptize females, the command including them, though they were not circumciſed, being not capable of it as I ſaid.

Fourthly, Then the case is this, Whether Gods command be to baptize Infants now, as it was to circcumise Infants then; this he denies, upon this ground, circumcision was not administred unto them as Disciples, but Disciples only are now to be baptized, and a Disciple is hee that denies himself, father, *&c.* takes up his crosse daily and followes Christ, *Luke* 14.26. But then they that did none of these, yea, Proselytes and their males were circumcised, though they did not believe.

Reply. First, that Proselytes and their males were cirumcised, though neither he nor they believed, hath been often said, but never proved, nor ever can be, and I have shewed the contrary.

Secondly, That none are to be baptized now, but Disciples, I grant it; but I say also none but Disciples were then circumcised, as is evident from the description of a Disciple, *Luke* 14. For whatsoever is required of any to be a Disciple, agrees to them then, as may be seen, *Psal.* 44. 22. with *Rom.* 8. 36. *Psal.* 45. 10. *Heb.* 11. 8. with this, *Luke* 14. *Gen.* 4. 8. with *John* 1. 3. 18. *Gen.* 21. 9. with *Gal.* 4. 29. where the Apostle saith, as it was then, so it is now, and as it is now, so was it then; and therefore there is no difference in that respect, although the word was not then used, yet the matter being common, we may make the word common also; and if all were not true Disciples then, but many degenerated, so it is now also.

Thirdly, Disciples are now, and were then of two sorts: First, such as begun (when God, as I may so say, first set up his School in in any place) as *Abraham* and his grown males, *Heb.* 11, &c. taking in their Infants with them; for upon this condition hee admitted them, that he would have their Infants also; and so in time of the Gospel to the *Jewes* and *Gentiles* at first setting it up: Secondly, Disciples are those, that being entred with their parents into the school and profession, continue successively so till God turn them off; and no otherwise were the *Jewes* from *Isaac* till Christs time Disciples, and so also it is now; to say therefore there is no command to baptize Infants now, because Disciples are to baptized, is not upon any just consequence. Besides, let any shew me a command of baptizing females, there being no command to circumcise them, (examples there are of baptizing them, but I suppose that without a command will not suffice) If any shall say, it is commanded, *Mat.* 28. where under the term of *nations* they are included.

I reply, Are not children a part of all nations, as they were a

part

part of the *Jewiſh* nation? But yee will ſay, they muſt be made Diſciples firſt?

Reply. Firſt, Diſciples, as I ſaid, are made two wayes, actually by profeſſion, or fœderally by imitation, as Infants were then, ſo Infants may be now.

Secondly, God taketh care of Infants now, and requires they ſhould be inſtructed in the diſcipline and admonition of the Lord; now God never took the care of any that were not his, and in that he commanded them to be nurſed up in his diſcipline, it plainly argueth, they are his Diſciples.

His fourth and laſt anſwer is the ſame with the former, from the difference of the ſubjects that were circumciſed, now to be baptized, there being the ſame reaſon of changing the ſubject, that there is of changing the Sacrament, *viz.* Chriſts coming; and if it were abſurd to circumciſe children now, becauſe they were circumciſed then, then it is abſurd to baptize Infants now, becauſe they were circumciſed them; becauſe Chriſts coming doth put an end to the ſubject alſo, and hath put another ſubject to be baptized; namely, believers and only believers.

Reply. Firſt, there is not the ſame reaſon of changing the ſubject, that there is of the change of the Sacrament, God changed the Sacraments he gave to *Adam* in Paradiſe, but hee changed not the ſubject, but continued the ſame offer of happineſſe to *Adam*, the ſame ſubject; but he continued not the ſame Sacrament.

Secondly, the Sacrament is not changed into another of another nature: For the grace ſignified in both is the ſame, the manner of ſignifying is the ſame in both ſacramentally, but the ſignes only are changed.

Thirdly, the ſubjects are not changed, by reaſon of Chriſts coming, as being types of him, (which I have diſproved before, though here again implyed) but becauſe of their unbelief, the kingdome being taken from them, becauſe they refuſed to ſubmit, *Mat.*21.22. and now the ſubjects ſhall be cut off, if they ceaſe to be loyall, and they ſhould not, if they had been loyall.

Fourthly, the change of Gods adminiſtration of his grace hath been divers; but the ſubjects to whom the grace was offered, were never changed, from *Adams* time to *Abrahams*, where were the ſame ſubjects, men, women, and Infants, none will ſay Infants were excluded, if they died before they came to yeers of diſcretion: From

Abrahams,

Abrahams time to *Moſes*, the adminiſtration of grace was changed, not the ſubjects; Infants alſo; from *Moſes* time it was more changed, till Chriſts time, the ſubjects were not changed, Infants not ſhut out, no, not Infants of Proſelytes; and why ſhould Infants be ſhut out ſince, ſeeing the offer of grace is the ſame, though the adminiſtration of it differs? but eſpecially with more inlargement. Upon all that hath been ſaid, it may appeare, that the conſequence of mine Argument is not weakened, and ſo the point proved by it certain, that as Infants were then circumciſed, ſo Infants are now to be baptized, baptiſme ſucceeding circumciſion.

The ſecond Part:

AND thus for reply to his full anſwer to the diſcourſe touching Infants baptiſme, it remains that I proceed with him in the reſt, about the form a Church; wherein firſt he ſaith, I ſpeak of agreement in this, that matter and form doe conſtitute a Church. Alſo, that the matter is a company of viſible Saints, profeſſing faith in the righteouſneſſe of Chriſt, and living accordingly. To which he anſwereth, Firſt, this definition agreeth not to Infants, which I would make to be ſubjects of baptiſme, who are born in ſinne, and are children of wrath, *Eph.* 2. 3. *Pſa.* 51.5. Secondly, nor doth it agree with the Jewiſh Church, which I would make to be a pattern for ours, in bringing grounds from them for baptizing infants, who never were required to make ſuch profeſſion at the time of their admiſſion, as all Churches and members added doe ſince Chriſts time, *Acts* 2. 41. & 8. 12, &c. Thus he.

Before I come to reply, let me give notice of this, That I cannot own theſe words thus expreſſed, That he and I with whom I had this diſcourſe, agreed of this; that matter and forme doe conſtitute a Church I am confident; and before we accorded had many paſſages to and fro, but proceeded not till wee conſented there, nor can I ſay that I writ it down. And touching the definition of the matter of a Church, as is there expreſſed, I am confident ſo farre as I can remember, it was none of mine, nor doe I now owne them; and therefore let all obſerve how vain and raſh he is, ſo ungrounded-

dedly

dedly to publiſh theſe things under my name unto all the world. Yet becauſe ſome things in the diſcourſe, I well remember to be mine, I ſhall cleare my way in paſſing this in a word or two, and ſetting down ſuch a definition of a Church as I have by me, and go along with him in the reſt, and to what he ſaith I make this reply. Firſt, I would ſay that the matter of a Church is a company of viſible Saints: And this I conclude to be clear in every place where a Church is ſtiled Saints, Beleevers, and the like. Secondly, this definition agrees to children as well as grown men, being Saints alſo, and holy ſeed of holy parents: though it is true they bee born in ſinne, and children of wrath by nature; ſo were infants in the old Teſtament as well as now, as the place *Pſal.* 51. by him alledged, evinceth: and the ſame is true of the holieſt men of yeares, and *Paul* confeſſeth himſelfe with others to be the children of wrath by nature, yea then when he ſaid it, there is no hinderance then why that deſcription may not agree to infants. Thirdly, it agreeth right well to the Jewiſh Church, who were not a company of prophane perſons, but a holy people unto God, a company of Saints, and no otherwiſe a Church, but as ſuch, or beleevers; and wee are upon theſe terms admitted & continued members of that Church, ſo long as it continued a church, as hath been ſhewed afore. So that the deſcription of the matter of a church, doth well agree to all churches and members of churches alwayes, nor are Churches to conſiſt of, or admit others unto them. Now a Church, I conceive to be an inſtitution of it, whereby a company of men and women called by the word of Gods grace, and ſome work of Gods Spirit upon them, doe joyn themſelves unto the Lord and one to another, by entring into covenant with the Lord, to have him to be the God of them & theirs, and they and theirs to be the Lords and his Chriſts: as alſo one with another, to meet together to worſhip God for his glory & their mutuall edification to life, according to Gods revealed will. Now as I tie no man to my expreſſions, ſo I ſhall be willing to learn of any that ſhall help me to a better underſtanding in this point: yet in this deſcription all the cauſes concurre. The efficient (an inſtitution of Chriſt) with the inſtrumentall, the Word in ſome effects upon their hearts; the materiall, a company of men and women ſo called, and from thence Saints and beleevers: the formall, (joyning themſelves to the Lord, and one with another) by entring into covenant, whereof there are two branches, one called, *Zach.* 11.

The

The ſtaffe of beauty, taking the Lord to be the God of them and theirs, and giving up themſelves and theirs to be the Lords: the other called, *The ſtaffe of bonds*, or *brotherhood*, and both the covenant, the finall to meet together to glorifie God the ſupreme, and edifie one another to life, with the meanes worſhipping God according to his own appointment revealed in his word: onely I would be underſtood of a Church in the conſtituting of it, which is continued in the ſame ſtate by ſucceſſion, till the Lord the efficient diſchurch them.

But to proceed, this confuter next ſaith, That I make this *quære*, Whether baptiſme be not the form of a church; and anſwering, No, giving reaſons of my deniall, I affirm a covenant acted is the form of it. To all which he anſwereth firſt in generall; And here he diſtinguiſheth between the form and the thing formed, and ſaith, That a Church being an Aſſembly, the form or faſhion thereof is the relation that every member poſſeſſeth from Chriſt their head, and each with other, wherby every law and ſervice is communicable and executed; concluding, that neither a covenant or baptiſme is the form of a Church: but baptiſme of a beleever is an inſtrumentall meanes by which a Church is made partaker of that forme which it hath, as by which it becomes a Church. Further, that the inſtrumentall meanes of the being of a Church, both of matter and form, is by conſent of love iſſuing forth from the covenant of grace made in and from our Lord, through one Spirit, one Faith, one Baptiſme, *Epheſ.* 4. 4, 5. And if any of theſe be wanting, and be not ſupplied, the Church can have no viſible exiſtence and being. From whence it followeth, though baptiſme bee not the form of a Church, yet being an eſſentiall meanes, and the laſt too of the viſible Church, where true baptiſme is wanting, there can be no true viſible Church.

Reply. Firſt, to let paſſe his diſtinction, onely this I ſay, that he confoundeth forme and figure as one thing, which are divers. For water in a round glaſſe or ſquare, hath this or that figure, or faſhion; but it is not the forme whereby water is water, and not another thing; and therefore form differs from figure and faſhion.

Secondly, whereas he denieth a covenant or baptiſme either to be a Churches form, he contradicteth what he ſaid before in his anſwer to my firſt argument to prove the covenant before Chriſt and after to be the ſame. It is true (ſaid he) that the coventnt of God maketh

maketh the Church both in the time of the Law and Gospel too: and a Church is nothing but a people in covenant with God. That saying of his here and there cannot be both true.

Thirdly, he saith, that the form of the Church is that relation that each member possesseth from Christ the head, and each with other, which is by consent of love.

Reply. First, the relation that each member possesseth from Christ the head, and each the other, is either internall (as Spirit, Faith, Love,) or externall, the manifestation of these: as they are internall, they cannot be the form of an externall visible church: as they are manifested outwardly, they cannot make the churches form, because they may manifest these graces; and yet be no church, nor members of a visible and this particular church. And indeed they are neither matter nor form (though hee makes them both;) but the manifestation of these maketh them to be fit matter for a church, which yet cannot be a church without the form added to the matter, and that is a covenant, (or as he calleth it, a consent, which indeed is a covenant) by which alone every Law and Service is communicable and excecuted.

Last of all he saith, that consent of love from one Spirit, Faith, and Baptisme, are essentially necessary meanes of the being of a church for matter and forme, *Ephes.* 4.4, 5. And if any of these bee wanting, then there can be no visible church.

Reply. First, in making all these to concurre to the matter and form of the church as meanes thereof, hee necessarily yeeldeth the form and matter to be something else differing from them all.

Secondly, he confounds baptisme with faith and love, which are internall graces, unlesse he means the externall profession of them flowing from the covenant of grace; which if he doe, then I conceive he yeelds as much as I require, that in a covenant or mutuall engagement of all parties, and one main part by profession of faith and love through one spirit, without which a covenant cannot be in the state we speak of it.

Thirdly, that of *Ephes.* 4. intends not to describe the forme of a church, but perswades to unity by a sevenfold unity, that they are already church-members, were all partakers of. Lastly, if baptisme may be wanting for a time, and yet a beleever essentially a church-member, as *Abraham* and his many males and females were before circumcised for the space of at least 14. yeares between the cove-

nant and circumciſion, and therefore doth not concurre to the conſtitution of a churches matter and forme, but for the confirmation of a church conſtituted in matter and forme before. And when a man of yeares is baptized in a church, is the baptized a viſible Saint, or no? If yea, for he may be no reall Saint, then his baptiſme doth not give him matter and forme, but hee hath both before, or elſe hee ought not to be baptized. And thus much to his generall diſcourſe.

In particular he goeth on, and ſaith, Firſt, as it is in natural birth, ſo it is in ſpirituall; but in naturall birth we have the beginning of our natural being among the world, and in the affairs of this life by our birth from our parents; therefore wee have the beginning of our ſpirituall and viſible being among the church, as in the affaires of life eternall by our ſpirituall birth: and this ſpirituall birth is baptiſme, and for that cauſe called the birth of water, *Joh.*3.5. *Tit.* 3.5. Therefore by adminiſtration of true baptiſme, the church is is truly ſtated and conſtituted in her true being.

Reply. Regeneration and natural birth hold proportion in many things together, but not in all, yet I will not trouble the diſcourſe there, the great miſtake is, in making baptiſme regeneration, and that which anſwereth naturall birth, and the places quoted will not prove it: For firſt, it will ask more skill then it may bee hee hath, to recover them out of the hands of many godly judicious, that deny thoſe places to be meant of baptiſme, but indeed of the new birth or regeneration by the Spirit putting forth the ſame effects upon the regenerate party that holds ſome proportion with the effects of water. But ſecondly, grant they be meant of baptiſme, yet it followes not that baptiſme is regeneration, becauſe in *John* there is the Spirit alſo, and in *Titus*, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, and a full work of regeneration wrought afore baptiſme, and themſelves alſo will neceſſarily require it, before they will baptize any; and therefore baptiſme is not regeneration, being not to be adminiſtred but to regenerate perſons knowne before to bee ſo. Thirdly, It is not therefore called the birth of water, but as bread and wine are called the body and bloud of Chriſt, circumciſion the covenant, the Lamb the Paſſover: as therefore the Lamb or Chriſt is the Paſſover, circumciſion the covenant, bread and wine the Lords body and bloud; ſo baptiſme is the new birth, that is, a ſigne or ſeale of regeneration, and not regeneration it ſelf. I diſlike the

phraſe

phraſe, *The birth of water.* Secondly, hee argues from the forme of baptiſme, which is dipping, and in that repect called a buriall with Chriſt, *Rom.* 6. 4. betokening our death and reſurrection. *Ergo*, as the riſing out of the grave at the laſt day, is the beginning of our ſtate of glory in our bodily being; ſo the riſing out of the water of baptiſme, is the beginning of our viſible ſtate of grace, and the beginning of our viſible ſpirituall life, is from that day, &c.

Reply. Firſt, here is the ſame miſtake with the former, making baptiſme the beginning of the ſpirituall viſible ſtate, whereas it is the ſigne and ſeale of it onely, which they are to have before: for doe they baptize a grown perſon dead, or alive? If alive, then viſibly or inviſibly in the ſtate of ſpirituall life: not inviſibly, for himſelf hath ſaid, they muſt profeſſe their faith firſt, and receive the word, *Acts* 2. elſe not to baptize any: their faith in Chriſt, their union thereby to him, their communion with him in death, buriall, &c. are to goe before their baptiſme. And himſelfe ſaith, it betokeneth how it is then the thing it ſelfe.

Secondly, whereas he makes dipping the form of baptiſme, he is in a double miſtake: Firſt, it is not the forme, but the matter of baptiſme: Secondly, he ſeemes to conclude ſprinkling unlawfull, whereas it is lawfull, as ſhall be ſeen afterward. Laſtly, he makes it a Sacrament of our laſt reſurrection to glory, the Text making it expreſly a Sacrament of our dying to ſinne, and reſurrection to new obedience.

Thirdly, he argues from the end of baptiſme, which amongſt others is to unite them to the viſible body of Chriſt, 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. *Gal.* 3. 27. 28. *Eph.* 4. 5, 6. and to diſtinguiſh them from the reſt of the world, *Col.* 2. 12. with 20. as circumciſion did diſtinguiſh the Jewes from the Heathens. But except baptiſme bee adminiſtred to beleevers, ſubjects onely capable of ſuch union, communion, and diſtinction; they cannot have that end effected, to be united to the body of Chriſt, and diſtinguiſhed from the reſt of the world. *Ergo*, baptiſme is to be adminiſtred to beleevers for that end.

Reply. They be beleevers firſt; (for ſo himſelfe ſaith) but to beleeve, is to bee in Chriſt, and by his faith forſaking ſinne and the world, chuſeth God to bee his God, and Gods people to bee his people: and as by the inward grace this is done effectually inviſibly; ſo by actuall profeſſion thereof (without which he were not to bee baptized) he viſibly declareth, and effecteth the ſame ends, and is

baptized as a ſigne and ſeale thereof, baptiſme there doth not effect thoſe ends, but ſignifie and ſeale thoſe ends before effected. This Argument ſtill laboureth of the former miſtake, making the ſigne to be the ſigne and the thing ſignified by it. Again, there are other ends of baptiſme beſides theſe, as himſelfe confeſſeth, and therefore the church may be formed a church before and without theſe ends to be effected by baptiſme, one end is to be a ſigne & ſeale of the covenant, which precedes baptiſme it ſelfe, and therefore baptiſme comes too late to doe that which was done before. Laſt of all, *Epheſ.*5.25.27. the party to bee baptized, is and muſt bee a member before, becauſe the church is to bee waſhed, not made a church by waſhing, but being a church to be waſhed.

A fourth argument he hath, is from the not iteration of baptiſme, it being to be adminiſtred but once, the Lords Supper often, in which reſpect baptiſme is the ſigne of our birth, and initiation, the Lords Supper of our growth and conſervation in the viſible body of Chriſt; and if a man may be conceived to have a being for a time in a viſible church without baptiſme the ſigne and Sacrament of his entrance and initiation, hee may have a continuance there alſo, and ſo conſequently baptiſme needleſſe. But baptiſme is needfull, as a means of the beginning of our viſible being in the viſible body of Chriſt. *Ergo*, without baptiſme they have no viſible being in the church, and ſo baptiſme is the form of it.

I anſwer: Firſt, he ſaith baptiſme is a ſigne and Sacrament of the beginning of our viſible being in the body of Chriſt; then, ſay I, it is not the beginning it ſelfe of our viſible being in the body, the ſigne and the thing ſignified being really diſtinct the one from the other, and the thing ſignified preceding the ſigne and ſeale of it. But of this before.

Secondly, he plainly contradicts himſelfe in ſaying, it is a ſigne and Sacrament of our entrance, and yet there is no viſible being in the church without baptiſme.

Thirdly, where he ſaith, If a man may have a being for a time without baptiſme, then may he have a continuance alſo; it follows not: for they had a being in the Jewiſh ſtate before they were circumciſed, but circumciſion was not needleſſe, neither ſhould they have continued in that ſtate without circumciſion.

Again, as the males had a being, and continued members of that church ſeven dayes, ſo if God had not commanded them to bee circum-

circumciſed the eighth day, but left it to their own wills, they ſhould have continued viſible members without it alwayes, as women did, being not commanded: *Abraham* and his family fourteen yeers, and they in the wilderneſſe forty. In like manner Gods command makes baptiſme neceſſary for all theſe ends which he hath appointed it for, and ſo for thoſe ends it is to be adminiſtred, and the omiſſion of it is a grievous ſin. But none of theſe ends is to give them a viſible being in a viſible church, but by way of ſignification and confirmation; *Ergo*, baptiſme is not the form of the church.

A 5th Argument is from the nature of Baptiſme, as it is the ſeal of the Covenant, if there be no viſible Ordinance before Baptiſme to note out their viſible being in the covenant whereby they may be known, then it is baptiſme that doth it: But there is no other viſible ordinance before baptiſme to note out their viſible being in the covenant whereby they may be known; *Ergo*, it is baptiſme that doth it; and ſo it is the form of the Church.

Anſw. 1. If he really grant it is the ſeal of the covenant, then it is not the covenant it ſelf, for which hee hath formerly argued.

Secondly, it muſt be conſidered, to whom baptiſme muſt note out their viſible being in the covenant; if to themſelves, they may know it before: for he that believeth hath the witneſſe in himſelf; if to others, either Chriſtians, they muſt know it before, or not baptize them; or elſe the world and baptiſme can no way notifie ſuch a thing unto them, they cannot take notice thereof, nor will they; they know them not, becauſe they have not known Chriſt, nor the Father. And if a man truly baptized fall off from his profeſſion, to whom doth it note that he is in the covenant, though it be known he was baptized? And our Saviour giveth a rule wherby all men ſhall know his Diſciples (not if baptized, but) if they love one another, and keep his commandements; and if any ſay he hath fellowſhip with God, and doth evill, hee lies, and all the world may know it, though they know he was viſibly baptized; *Ergo*, baptiſme cannot be the form of a church, ſeeing it doth not note out their viſible being in covenant, which is notified before; and by other means, both before and after: Laſt of all, again he contradicteth himſelf, in ſaying here, that baptiſme is the form of the church, and yet before denying baptiſme or the covenant either to be the form of it.

The 6th Argument is taken from the commiſſion given to the firſt, *Matth.* 28. 19. where the Participle baptizing, concurres to making

them

them Diſciples: and *Mark.*16.16. Faith puts a man into the ſtate of ſalvation before God, Baptiſme before men; the reaſon runs thus: If from commiſſion to the firſt planters, baptiſme was required to make a perſon a Diſciple, in a viſible ſtate of ſalvation, and ſtated in all other ordinances of Chriſts kingdom, then baptiſme ſo adminiſtred is that which gives being to a true viſible Church. I anſwer,

Firſt, the Scripture requires, firſt that they be made Diſciples, and then being Diſciples to be baptized, and therefore baptiſme doth not make them Diſciples: Again, faith makes them Diſciples in the ſtate of ſalvation before God, and profeſſion of that faith (and not baptiſme) doth make viſibly and outwardly Diſciples in the ſtate of ſalvation before men, *Rom.* 10.9, 10. They that baptize any, muſt know them to be viſibly ſuch before they baptize them, elſe not baptize them, as himſelf hath ſaith, from *Acts* 2.21. 8.12.

Secondly, Baptiſme is required to ſtate them in the obſervation of all the ordinances of Chriſts kingdome, not by making them a church, or member to whom only ſuch ordinances; yea, baptiſme it ſelf doth belong, but to make them fit to obſerve them, being members; and there are other things, though they be baptized, that may hinder them from obſervaton of thoſe ordinances; as in the old Teſtament circumciſion did not make them a church, but being a church they were to be circumciſed, without which they might not obſerve the Paſſeover, but there were other things alſo which did hinder them from obſervation of the Paſſeover, though they were circumciſed.

And thus, of his Poſition, and the grounds of it, That baptiſme is the thing that formeth the church; only if I underſtand his cloſe, hee flatly contradicts himſelf, in ſaying baptiſme is the means and thing that formeth the church, and yet it is not the outward form of our church formed: For, either it formeth the church with an outward or inward: but not inward before God, Faith doth that, and therefore the outward form it muſt be; and ſo hee ſaid in his laſt Argument baptiſme puts a man into the ſtate of ſalvation before men. Again, hee grants the church to be formed with an outward form without baptiſme, in ſaying baptiſme is not that outward form of the church formed. If a formed church, it hath a form that formed it, but the form is not baptiſme; *Ergo*, he overthrows all that he hath argued for, or elſe the church hath two outward formes;

forms; one he grants the church hath without baptiſme, the other by baptiſme, which theſe ſix arguments plead for. It were well if he agreed with himſelf.

Next he anſwereth the Reaſons I ſet down (as he ſaith) to prove that baptiſme is not the form of a viſible church; The firſt whereof is this: That which giveth being to a church muſt be removed to make a church ceaſe to be a church; but Baptiſme cannot be removed from a church whileſt it remains a church; *Ergo.* Hee anſwers, It is as eaſie to remove baptiſme from a church, as to remove a church from being a church.

Reply. Firſt, this is a very eaſie anſwer, and toucheth no part of the Argument. Again, a church is unchurched not by unbaptizing the baptized (as it muſt be, if it were the form of a church) but by deſtroying the church it ſelf. The church muſt firſt in reaſan be made no church, before ordinances can ceaſe to be ordinances in that church; but deſtroy the church, and baptiſme will not be baptiſme; as the *Edomites* circumciſion was not circumciſion when they were not the church; the *Jewes* circumciſion, and all that they do, are nullities to this day, ſince they ceaſed to be a church.

A ſecond Reaſon is this; That which being wanting to a church conſtituted, doth not cauſe the church to be no church, that cannot be the form of the church; but baptiſme may be wanting to a church conſtituted, and yet it be a church: As circumciſion to Infants ſeven dayes, alwayes to all females, to them in the wilderneſſe forty yeers, *Joſh.* 5. *Ergo:*

Anſw. He denies the ſecond Propoſition; That baptiſme may be wanting to a church conſtituted, his Reaſon, becauſe a church is conſtituted by baptiſme; and ſo *Joſh.* 5. hee ſaith, that caſe was extraordinary, having ſpeciall diſpenſation from God himſelf, ſupplyed by miraculous Sacraments, during the time of their neceſſary forbearances of circumciſion and the Paſſeover, while in travells, unleſſe wee can ſhew a like caſe, and ſupply of miraculous Sacraments, we cannot conclude, that a church is a church, or men members of a church without baptiſme by which they are conſtituted.

Reply. Firſt, the Reaſon he gives, that baptiſm cannot be wanting in a church conſtituted, becauſe it is conſtituted by baptiſme, is of no force, becauſe a church is not conſtituted by baptiſme, as I have ſhewed before, and he begs the queſtion.

Secondly, To that of *Joſhua* the 5th, the caſe was not extraordinary,

nary, nor need they be hindred by their travells, no more then they were hindred by the danger they were in, after they were over *Jordan*, for all the fighting men 60000 thousand, were now all sore by circumcision; easie had it been for the *Canaanites* to have come upon them and slain them, as *Jacobs* two sons did the *Sichemites*. If any shall say, that God could, and did defend them: I say, was not God as able to defend them in the wilderneſſe where the most of them would have been alwayes well? To say that God dispensed with them, is not proved; it is as easie to say hee did not, and who so reads *Josh.* 5. 2, &c. shall have cause to conclude, that they sinned in omitting it (though God imputed it not unto them;) besides, they stayed sometime a yeere in a place; and often long enough to have been healed: I rather think God did not dispense with them, and that they sinned in omitting it, and therefore called the reproach of *Egypt*; and for the miraculous Sacraments they had, it was not to supply the absence of the other ordinances, for then they should not have begun before these were taken away as they did; nor should these have been continued after those were given them, as they were, especially the Passeover celebrated the second yeer, *Numb.* 9. 1, *&c.* and for any thing I know continued all the time, till they came into the land, yeerly according to institution: and so *Calvin* upon *Johshua* the 5th thinketh, and that God did tolerate them, though not circumcised, and a reason he gives, because they offered sacrifices continually, which was not much lesse then to eat the Passeover, no man being to bring a sacrifice that was unclean, as all uncircumcised were; nor is it probable that all were circumcised, who celebrated the Passeover, *Numb.* 9. and therefore Manna and the Rock did not supply the absence of the Passeover, but they were both together for a time, as circumcision, and the sea, and cloud to all that were circumcised; some whereof came into the land: And therefore, though I shew no extraordinary case, nor miraculous sacraments to supply the absence of ordinary; yet from that place (especially adding the case of Infants alwayes seven dayes without circumcision, and sometimes more, and females alwayes, and yet members) I see nothing that is said, but as then the church was a church, and all members, though many not circumcised: so a church may be a church now, and yet baptisme for a time wanting (though it ought not to be) and then baptisme is not the form of the church.

A third

A third Reaſon I give (as he ſaith, for I cannot remember I uſed a word of it) is this: That which is an adjunct to a thing, cannot be the form of it; but baptiſme is an adjunct of a church; *Ergo.*

To this hee anſwereth: This is not againſt his queſtion as hee ſtateth it, becauſe that which is an adjunct may be a means of forming the thing to which it is adjoyned, and ſo baptiſme is.

Reply. Firſt, how hee ſtates his Queſtion is nothing to mee, his Anſwer muſt be to the queſtion as I ſtated it; ſeeing he takes upon him to refute it: In altering the ſtate of the queſtion therefore, hee ſhewes he had nothing to ſay againſt it as I ſet it down; But,

Secondly, I grant an adjunct may be a means of forming the ſubject, ſo as it is by the adjunct, and without that adjunct the ſubject could not be ſo formed and denominated: As freedome is an adjunct to man, and is neceſſary to make him be, and named a free man, but it is not neceſſary to make him a man; he may be a man without it: So baptiſme is neceſſary to forme a church, or member, to be, and named a baptized church and member, but it concurres not therefore to make a church or member to be a church or member, and therefore that form whereby it is, and called a church, or member, ariſeth from ſomething elſe. A ſubject may have twenty adjuncts, but not one, nor all make it a ſubject, that it is before the adjuncts, and without them.

A 4th Reaſon, That which is the ſeal of the covenant cannot be the form of the church; but baptiſme is the ſeal of the covenant; *Ergo.* His anſwer is, That the ſeal of the covenant may be a means to conſtitute and put the church into an outward viſible form, and referres to his fifth Argument, where hee hath ſpoken ſomething before.

Reply. He anſwered to neither Propoſition here. That baptiſme is the ſeal of Gods outward covenant, cannot be denied, that baptiſme therefore cannot be the form of a viſible church, is evident: as a ſeal cannot be the form of that place, or honour which a man hath by the kings grant under writing, it is the grant and contract that makes the man to honour this ſtate or that from the king, and not the ſeal, though the ſeal be uſefull and neceſſary: So here, baptiſme makes not the church to be the church, but it is added to Gods covenant made with the Church before, whereby it is a Church, and this ſeal added to the covenant made for confirmation, without which the ſtate would be the ſame, though not ſo authenticall to us, in regard of our weakneſſe: For his reference, ſee my anſwer to it.

A fifth Reaſon, That which remains when a man is excommunicate, and is not to be adminiſtred to reſtore him again, when cut off, that cannot be the form of the church; but baptiſme remains, when a man is excommunicated, nor is to be adminiſtred to reſtore him to membership when cut off; *Ergo.*

To which hee anſwereth, by denying the Aſſumption, that is, that baptiſme remains when a man is excommunicate, nor is to be adminiſtred again when he is to be reſtored; and denying this, hee muſt affirm that baptiſme doth not remain where a man is no member by excommunication, and ſuch a man muſt be baptized, that he may be reſtored again. To make this good, he giveth a long anſwer, which I contract into theſe Propoſitions:

First, that by faith a man poſſeſſeth Chriſt, and ſo baptiſme and membership with the Church.

Secondly, that ſome have true ſaving faith, and ſo they have Chriſt, baptiſme, and membership in the truth of all and ſavingly, and ſome have but ſeeming faith, and ſo have Chriſt, baptiſme, and membership, not in truth, but ſeemingly, (yet accounted by others true that cannot diſcern them to be but ſeeming.)

Thirdly, that a true believer excommunicate for ſin, is not really deprived of faith, Chriſt, baptiſme, and membership, but ſeemeth only to be cut off; but hee that ſeemed to have faith, but had not indeed, excommunicate for ſin, is cut wholly and really from Chriſt, *&c.* which he only ſeemed to have, and no faith, Chriſt, *&c.* can be ſaid to remain, being neither believer, nor baptized, nor member indeed, becauſe hee forſaking the grounds and ends of his baptiſme, he forſaketh baptiſme, which was adminiſtred upon theſe grounds, and for theſe ends.

Fourthly, hee that by the renewall of his repentance returneth to his faith again (by which hee is to be reſtored to communion with the church again after excommunication) returneth thereby to his baptiſme and membership again.

Reply. Granting the firſt Propoſition, that faith poſſeſſeth a man of Chriſt, *&c.* and likewiſe this in the ſecond, that ſome have faith in Chriſt, *&c.* really and ſaving, in the truth of all; but where he ſaith ſome have but ſeeming faith, (and yet baptized, &c.) and ſeem to have Chriſt, baptiſme, and membership, but have none in truth, I deny that theſe are ſeeming, unleſſe as oppoſed to ſaving, ſpirituall and ſupernaturall; thus indeed many have not, nor can

any

any have theſe things, but only elect perſons, and ſo their faith, and all is ſeeming: But faith conſidered in it ſelf, it is certaine that many have that faith they profeſſe they have, as the devills, and do believe as they ſay they do; nor do I think, that if a man knew one to be a reprobate, (unleſſe in the caſe of ſin unto death) yet having and profeſſing faith; hee is not to be rejected, without ſome ſpeciall word of God: Thus *Abraham* and *Iſaac*, circumciſed *Iſhmael* and *Eſau*, though they knew before they were reprobates: And our Saviour put *Judas* into Apoſtleſhip when he knew what hee was to the full.

Secondly, a man having ſuch a faith, is in Chriſt, in a ſenſe, *John* 15. hath baptiſme and church-memberſhip indeed, and in the truth of it, though not ſpiritually and ſavingly, I cannot ſay theſe are all, or any of them ſeeming, but in oppoſition to ſaving; ſo they ſeem to be indeed, but are not, *Heb.*6.4.9. they are really enlightened, they taſt of the heavenly gift, and fall away, and periſh for ever; but they had no part in thoſe as accompanying ſalvation, theſe are diſtinct one from another: The one ſort are acquired by naturall powers, and are morall only, thoſe will never ſave them; the other are infuſed, ſpirituall, ſupernaturall, and alwayes accompany ſalvation.

To the third Propoſition, I ſay, that a believer to ſalvation excommunicate for ſome ſin, is not deprived of the faith he had, but that he is cut off from memberſhip (and ſo from baptiſme, if it be the form of his memberſhip,) it is moſt certain, as much as the other is, and it is more then a ſeeming to be cut off, being ratified in heaven (his everlaſting eſtate remaining with God inalterable) and he that ſeemed to have ſaving faith, *&c.* but had not, is not deprived of that faith he had, by excommunication, nor cut off otherwiſe from his baptiſme and memberſhip then the former, (*in foro humano*) being things that hee had as really as the former, though not of the ſame kinde, nor to the ſame benefit. And if all were but ſeeming in the Refuters ſenſe, certainly, his excommunication will be but ſeeming too; and doth this ſeem to be a ſeemly thing, to ſpeak thus of the things of God?

To the fourth, he that by repentance returneth to his faith again, that is, in true meaning, to an intire ſtanding in the profeſſion of faith, returns to his baptiſme and memberſhip again. I grant, that by renewall of repentance, hee is to be reſtored from under the cen-

ſure unto communion with the church again: And hence I gather, that faith and repentance profeſſed, are the means whereby hee was ſtated in the covenant and memberſhip, and therefore now required of him again, to ſet him in his former ſtate, and not baptiſme, which certainly would have been under ſome prejudice by excommunication, and muſt have been cleered as well as his profeſſion, if that had conſtituted his memberſhip, eſpecially, if he had but ſeeming faith, baptiſme and memberſhip before; for let mee put this caſe, which certainly may, and ſometimes doth fall out; that a ſeeming believer, having ſeeming baptiſme, &c. (to ſpeak his language) is excommunicated, and ſo is cut off from all that he only ſeemed to have, he had no baptiſme and memberſhip indeed, but ſeemed to have; and from all that is really and wholly cut off, nothing remaines; this perſon was not before really converted, but under the ſtate of cenſure he is really converted, and gives full ſatisfaction to the church, ſhall he be reſtored to his ſeeming baptiſme and memberſhip that he had before by his ſeeming faith? (rather he cannot be reſtored to that ſeeming ſtate, becauſe he ſaith nothing remains) Or ſhall hee have a new memberſhip, and reall in the truth of it, for his reall faith and repentance? but this muſt be by a new & reall baptizing; (the former not remaining) and therefore, though repentance of him that was a true believer, recovers his former ſtanding in the covenant, and ſo his baptiſme, which he was not really deprived of; yet it muſt needs be, that he that did not truly believe, being now really converted, cannot receive his former ſeeming baptiſme (nor were it worth the recovering) by his repentance, but muſt have a reall baptiſme added to him for his reall faith inſtead of that ſeeming baptiſme that he had by his ſeeming faith. The truth is, neither true believer nor ſeeming (as he ſpeaks) have either of them their baptiſme taken away by cenſure, but both their memberſhips really, and not ſeemingly, and by repentance are reſtored to their former rights and memberſhip.

That therefore that muſt be to make a man a member, and the deſtruction whereof makes a man no member, and the renewing whereof muſt be to reſtore him to be a member again, that is the form of a church-member, and ſo of a church; but baptiſme doth not make a man a viſible member, nor is baptiſme nullified to make him no member, but remains ſtill true baptiſme; nor is it to be renewed to reſtore him to his memberſhip again; therefore baptiſme is not the form of the church: For to make a thing to ceaſe to be that it was, muſt

must neceſſarily be by taking away of the form, by w^ch^ it was that it was: for ſo long as that form remains, you cannot make the thing to be any other, or not that it was, but in making a member no member, there is a deſtruction of that form whereby he was a member, that is, a reall caſting him out from being the Lords, or having the Lord to be his, and to be delivered up to Satan, likewiſe a caſting him out from being one of Gods people, to be of the world again (as *Demas*,) and the contrary hereunto muſt be reacted to reſtore a member. Therefore this alone is the forme of a member, and ſo of a Church. And this is no other thing but a Covenant acted (as before I deſcribed,) therefore a Covenant is the form of the Church.

This I affirmed, and he proceedeth to diſprove, ſetting downe a Propoſition, and the proofes of it that I alledged. The Propoſition is this: An outward covenant acted between God and a company of beleevers to be one anothers, and for the like among themſelves, is the form of the viſible church. I cannot ſay theſe were my expreſſions, yet I ſhall juſtifie the Propoſition, That a viſible Covenant (according to my former diſtinction) is the form of a viſible church. His anſwer to this is, That the covenant of God makes the church; but that any can be concluded to have an outward being in the covenant of the Goſpel now without baptiſme, hee denieth, requires me to prove it, and ſaith, he hath proved the contrary before. To which, with my anſwer to it, I referre you.

Hee goeth on, and ſaith, Whereas I ſay a company of beleevers acting a covenant to become one anothers amongſt themſelves, to be the form of the church. He anſwereth, By the ſame reaſon (if without baptiſme at preſent) they may receive the forme of the church without adminiſtration of the Goſpel for the future, which he conceives will be abſurd to affirm.

Reply. Firſt, the adminiſtrations of the Goſpel doe not concurre to the forme of the church, and therefore ſhe hath her forme without them, nor could ſhe bee partaker of them, but being a church firſt. They are neceſſary for her well-being, not her being: And if ſhee ſhould neglect the adminiſtration of the Goſpel, and adminiſter the contrary, yet ſhe ſhould be a church ſtill by her firſt conſtitution, till God caſt her off, which without queſtion in time hee will doe, though ſhe doe but neglect his.

Secondly, a church receives her form to be a church for adminiſtrations

niſtrations ſake, and to enjoy thoſe adminiſtrations to bee exerciſed therein according to Gods word; and therefore ſhee will not be wanting to her ſelf herein. If I ſhall ſay, If baptiſme be the form of a church, then by the ſame reaſon ſhee may receive the forme without all adminiſtration of the Goſpel for the future. I conceive it would be abſurd to affirm it. There is nothing in what hee ſaid therefore worth anſwering. And the ſame hath been ſaid and anſwered before. Secondly, he ſaith, God hath appointed no ſuch thing for men to act ſuch a covenant for any ſuch end; and therefore ſo to doe, is will-worſhip, invention of man, and in Gods worſhip plain ſuperſtition, and flat breach of the ſecond commandement; and therefore if it be the form of a Church, it is a ſuperſtitious church, which is ſo formed by ſuch a ſuperſtitious action.

Reply. I grant, all humane inventions in Gods worſhip, are ſinfull, ſuperſtitious, and flat breaches of the ſecond commandement, and added to Gods worſhip, doe pollute the ſame. But ſecondly, it doth not diſanull a church that ſome inventions of men are joyned (which ought not to be) to Gods worſhip; nor doe I thinke that himſelfe thinkes as he ſaith, that God hath not appointed men to act ſuch a covenant for any ſuch end; becauſe he hath ſaid many times, and granted, a few lines before theſe words, that the covenant of God makes the church. Now a covenant of God is that which is acted between him and beleevers outwardly with whom he firſt makes it (any other I ſuppoſe he underſtood not by it) and ſo continued in by them following, till God cut them off. If thus, then ſuppoſe it ſhould be a miſtake to ſay (to become one anothers alſo) that cannot ſo alter the covenant as to make it ſuperſtitious, or a humane invention. And when they baptize a man in yeares, will they not firſt require him to take God in Chriſt to be his God, and to ſubmit to him in all things, &c. And is not this a covenant acted, and the end of it to be to form him a church-member? What invention of man is in this? But if the proofe be found good, this will be found his miſtake ſo to ſay; and therefore I ſhall ſtay till we come to them.

Thirdly, he ſaith, A covenant acted by beleevers to become one anothers, cannot be a forme of a true viſible church; becauſe it may be with ignorance both of the nature and duties of a true church, as is proved by preſuppoſing it to be the forme of the church before Baptiſme.

Reply.

Reply. First, I see no force in this reason: for none ought to be ignorant of the nature and duties of a true church before they bee joyned, but to be well catechised first, nor is there any colour of reason to prove that such may be ignorant as are joyned by a covenant, by presupposing it to bee the form of the Church before baptisme.

Secondly, a covenant acted by beleevers, and baptizing them, are not supposed to be so distant in time, as that they may not goe together, but the covenant must proceed in order of nature and time, baptisme being but the seale of it, and is but an idoll without it; the covenant making them capable of baptisme, and nothing else: and baptisme being a visible and outward seale, it must needs be an outward and visible covenant to which it is added, and so maketh a member to be a formed member. The Scriptures quoted by him, 1 *Cor.* 1. 15, &c. to prove that all their externall relations must flow from their relation and union in baptisme, are absurdly alledged; and there is no relation and union in baptisme, but by way of signification and confirmation. The union must goe before, if they doe not professe faith in Christ, (whereby they are united unto Christ) before baptized, they must not be baptized, as himselfe hath often said, and is truth.

But to come to the proofes I added to my proposition, the first he saith, was this, If the Kingdome of heaven, that is, the Church state that we now have, be the same that the Jewes had; then if such a covenant as I have above expressed, was the forme of that Church, it is the form of ours now: But the Kingdome of heaven (that is, the visible Church state that wee now have,) is the same they had. *Ergo*, If such a covenant was the forme of that church, it is also the form of these now. And the form of the Jewish Church was such a covenant. *Ergo.* He answereth first, If the Church state then and now bee not the same, then the form of that is not the form of this, (and so my Argument grounded upon an IF, is nothing.) But the Church state then (constituted of a naturall seed) was not that we have now (constituted of a spirituall seed.) *Ergo.*

Reply. In denying the Church state then and now to bee the same, he flatly contradicteth the Scripture, *Mat.* 21. 33, 43. where it is clear, that the Vineyard and Kingdome of heaven being the Church state they possessed, is threatned to be taken away and given to other nations. It is the same Vineyard and Kingdome taken away and given.

Se-

Secondly, it is a groſſe miſtake to ſay, that they were a Church ſtated of *Abrahams* natural ſeed, which hath oft already been gainſaid by me: Gods intention in entring into covenant with them, was to have them all ſpirituall, hee conſtituted them not a church as a naturall ſeed, but as ſpirituall; and if all were not ſpirituall, it was their ſinne: And all now in Church eſtate are not ſpirituall, many are carnall. And the Jewes ſtill remain naturall branches to be graffed in again, though not as naturall ſeed, but as beleeving, &c. Secondly, he ſaith, where I ſaid, A covenant acted by beleevers amongſt themſelves, to become one anothers, to be the forme of the Church, and here arguing from the ſtate of the Jewes to prove this form, which did never form themſelves ſo; in ſo doing I overthrow my ſelfe, and argue from my proofe to overthrow my principle.

Reply. Firſt, let all obſerve, that he conſtantly leaves out a part of my words, and that of greateſt weight, (*viz.* A covenant acted between God and themſelves, though I adde theſe words alſo.)

Secondly, I ſay, the Jewes were formed a Church eſtate, and only by ſuch a covenant, and this will bee evident by clearing thoſe foure particulars I brought to prove that part of my argument.

The firſt is this, The entrance into it with *Abraham*, his family, and ſeed, was by a covenant acted viſibly, and outwardly: This was that which diſtinguiſhed them, and made them differ from other people, and whereby they became the Lords, and the Lord theirs. This was a viſible and outward covenant, becauſe the ſeale of it was outward and viſible, and *Iſhmael* and *Eſau* were in it, and reprobates as well as elect, and this covenant was made with *Abraham* and his family, at leaſt 14 yeares before they were circumciſed, *Gen.* 17. that being but the renewall of the covenant made before; onely let this be noted, that *Abraham* and his family were all this time in covenant, and a called people, and ſo a church viſibly formed: for no man can think that he & his were all that time under that covenant without a form. A fœderall form they had certainly, (that is, a church forme) and circumciſion did not put the fœderall form upon them, but was added for confirmation on both parts: Yet his anſwer is, that this proves not the forme of the church to be ſuch a covenant as is by me expreſſed, acted by a company of beleevers to become one anothers. For *Abraham* and his

ſeed

ſeed, reprobates and elect enter into it; now *Abraham* was but one believer, *Iſhmael* his ſeed, who entred in with him was a reprobate.

Reply. Firſt, it was a covenant, acted between God and *Abraham*, and his family, becauſe they were ſigned and ſealed to the covenant fourteen yeers after.

Secondly, though reprobates and elect were in the covenant, yet that doth not diſprove a covenant acted by believers, to be the form of a church, ſeeing many reprobates do believe for a time. I do not mean they are known to be ſo, but many prove ſo afterward, and himſelf doth confeſſe that they have not infallible judgement, but may be, and many times are deceived; and if hee ſhould not confeſſe, yet the Scriptures cleer it in *Simon Magus* caſe, *Judas*, &c.

Thirdly, though *Abraham* was but one believer, and *Iſhmael* a reprobate, yet they might joyn together in covenant, becauſe at firſt *Iſhmael* was but an Infant, and not preſently known to be a reprobate, and more then *Iſhmael* entred into the firſt covenant, as *Sarah* his wife; and above three hundred males, who therefore had the ſeal of the covenant ſet upon them, which could not have been, if they had not been in covenant. Where I ſaid, circumciſion was not the covenant, but the token of it, *Gen.* 17. 11. He anſwereth, it was not only a token of it, but a part of the covenant it ſelf, being that whereby the parties were bound to keep the whole Law, *Gal.* 5. 3. and therefore God ſaid, *Let every man childe be circumciſed*; and hee that was not, brake Gods covenant, therefore the covenant here ſpoken of, was ſuch as was entred into by circumciſion, but not ſuch as was acted by believers, and ſo to be the form of the church.

Reply. I deny circumciſion to be a part of the covenant, as without which the covenant is not intire and a reall formall covenant, elſe *Abraham*, *Sarah*, and his family, were not in the covenant all theſe fourteen yeers before circumciſion; he grants it is a ſign of the covenant, and I will grant him, that as the ſigne of the thing may be a part of the thing ſignified, ſo may circumciſion be a part of the covenant, and no otherwiſe; and as a ſeal is a part of the thing ſealed, and not elſe, and though it be called covenant oftentimes, yet it is by impropriety of ſpeech: As in the Lords Supper bread and wine are called the body and blood of the Lord, and baptiſme regeneration, becauſe they ſignifie and ſeal thoſe things to faith which are ſignified by them; where hee ſaith, the parties were bound thereby to keep the whole Law, *Gal.* 5. 3. it is a groſſe miſtake, for it did

ſeal to the righteouſneſſe of faith, and not to the righteouſneſſe of the Law, nor bound them more, nor otherwiſe to fulfill the Law, then baptiſme doth us now. It's true, the Apoſtle ſaith as much, but,

Firſt, he ſpeaks it in reſpect of the times then and after, not with reſpect to times before.

Secondly, hee ſpeaks it in a certain ſenſe, that is, when men make it an ingredient unto juſtification; they that do ſo renounce juſtification by Chriſt alone, and ſeek to be juſtified by their own righteouſneſſe, and ſo they are bound to fulfill the whole Law, or never to be juſtified; how elſe could *Paul* circumciſe *Timothy*? Act. 16. Would he do that then which he condemneth here? or did it oblige others otherwiſe then it did *Timothy* or *David*, *Iſaiah*, &c. It was Gods ordinance and inſtitution, it bound them to no ſuch thing; but that aroſe from their corrupt underſtanding of the things, turning the covenant of grace into a covenant of works unto themſelves; and the ſame may be ſaid of baptiſme now.

Let this therefore be attended, that God did never diſpenſe a covenant of works to the *Jewes*, but it was a covenant of grace, and circumciſion the ſigne and ſeal of it, and not the covenant it ſelfe; and the covenant was acted between God and *Abraham*, and his family and ſeed believers, they and theirs to be the Lords, and to take God to be the God of them and theirs, and ſo to become one anothers in the Lord, whereby they were made the people of God, and a viſible church truly conſtituted.

My ſecond particular was this; the eſtabliſhment of it in the plains of *Moab*, but this eſtabliſhment was by a covenant acted, *Deut.* 26. 17, 18. and 29. 10, 15. In which God avouched them to be his people, and they avouched him to be their God, and their young children alſo with them; nor could circumciſion be the covenant here, nor part of it, or ingredient into it, becauſe they had not circumciſed in forty yeers, ever ſince they came out of *Egypt*; nor did they circumciſe any now, nor afterward, till *Moſes* was dead, and *Joſhua* had brought them through *Jordan*, into the land, *Joſhua* 5.

To this he anſwereth divers things.

Firſt, that this was but a renewall of the covenant made with *Abraham*, *Iſaac*, and *Jacob* before, which they entred into with God in behalf of them and their children, by being circumciſed; and therefore, they being before did not now begin to be a church, and therefore this doth not prove, that a covenant acted by a company

of

of believers ſhould be it that did conſtitute them a church now.

Reply. Firſt, I grant this was but a renewall of the covenant made with *Abraham*, &c. and upon his grant, inferre that this was a ſpirituall covenant, and not carnall; and the ſame with *Abrahams* and ours, which before he oppoſed mee in.

Secondly, hee ſaith they entred into the covenant by circumciſion.

Reply. It is falſe, *Abraham* and his were not circumciſed till fourteen yeers after, and now few of them in yeers were circumciſed before, nor any now.

Thirdly, they did not now begin to be a church, being one before. It's true, but the renewall of their church eſtate here (after many provocations of God, and many declarations againſt them of Gods anger, whereby they might feare that God would own them no more) being by a covenant acted formally and outwardly between God and them (as is cleerly expreſſed in the Text) doth fully ſhew, that both now and then they were found Gods people as believers, acting a covenant betwixt God and them, and one another; and ſeeing hee grants this to be the ſame with that of *Abraham*, &c. that was alſo thus acted is out of queſtion as this here; though therefore a covenant acted now did not conſtitute them a church, yet a covenant is acted now, and is for the renewing of their church eſtate; therefore much more was it ſo in the firſt conſtitution, every thing decayed in the true forme of it, being made the ſame it was by renewing the ſame form, and otherwiſe cannot be the ſame: Nor did circumciſion here concurre, nor any thing elſe, and yet perfectly ſtated a church, and ſo called, *Acts* 7. 1.

Secondly, hee anſwereth; whereas I ſay circumciſion was no ingredient here, having not circumciſed, during the forty yeers, nor now. Hee conceives, notwithſtanding that circumciſion was an ingredient in their parents, who thereby entred into covenant for themſelves and theſe their children, as the covenant here expreſſed did comprehend the poſterity to come.

Reply. Firſt, howſoever they ſtood intire in the covenant and church-eſtate without perſonall circumciſion; for except *Moſes*, *Caleb*, and *Joſhua*, there was not a man of thoſe 600000. that came out of *Egypt* alive, and all born in the wilderneſſe during the forty yeers were uncircumciſed, and at the time of this covenant making not

one was circumiſed, and ſo the church conſiſted of a company of men perſonally uncircumciſed, and performed ſervices to God and each other, which ought to have been done by circumciſed perſons only. In like manner, men and women believing the Word of God, and doing as theſe did, may become thereby a true viſible church, though they were not baptized before, nor are baptized at preſent, covenanting, and perform ſervices to God and each other.

Secondly, if they injoyed their perfect church-eſtate (being not perſonally circumciſed) by vertue of their parents circumciſion before them, then certainly, as much may be granted now; that by vertue of a parents believing, and being baptized, their Infants may be counted, and really are, in the covenant before they be baptized. If it be ſaid, theſe were grown men, and expreſſed their faith in God? I anſwer, All were not grown men, many were Infants; yea, poſterity, for, and with whom this covenant was made, were not yet born; and for the reſt, what faith the moſt of them had, may be ſeen, *Deut.* 29. 4.

Thirdly, hee anſwereth, it was an extraordinary caſe, and they had miraculous ſacraments in ſtead of circumciſion and the Paſſeover, &c.

Reply. To all this I have ſpoken before; yet a word or two: Firſt, hee calleth them miraculous ſacraments here and before, but he found fault with me for calling them ordinances, (which is all one) ſacraments they were therefore, though extraordinary; nor did the ſea continue with them all this time, being a tranſient act, and many hundred thouſands never paſt through the ſea, nor did the cloud baptize them all, till circumciſion was adminiſtred to them all, *Joſh.* 5. The cloud ceaſed on the other ſide *Jordan*, and continued not till they came into the land; therefore all the members were not perſonally conſtituted members by that miraculous ſacrament of baptiſme, which gives them (hee ſaith) their imitation. Further, he ſaith, that the acting of a covenant by a company of believers, was not the ſame of that church then, but the communication of Gods covenant by circumciſion ordinarily with the whole nation believers and Infidels, and whoſoever of any nation that would be circumciſed and joyn with them to worſhip, much leſſe hath it any conſequence to prove it ſo now.

Reply. Firſt, I have proved that a covenant acted by them as beleevers, did make them to be the people of God, and circumciſion

was

was ordinarily added as a ſigne and ſeale thereof: But in that hee ſaith, the whole Nation, beleevers and infidels, it is an unchriſtian ſpeech, nor ever will he prove, that any of the nation were infidels, nor any of any nation joyning with them, though many of them did not beleeve as they ſhould, yet beleevers they all were, and God manifeſted it in accepting their ſacrifices, pardoning their ſins, and making an atonement for them by the Prieſts adminiſtrations. It is therefore injurious to the grace of God ſo to ſpeak, and juſtly to be blamed.

Nextly, he comes to my third particular, by which I conceived the form of the Jewiſh church ſtate outwardly, was by a covenant acted by a company of beleevers, &c. which is from the renewall of their eſtate after ſome apoſtaſie, 2 *Chron.* 15.12, 13, 16. & 34. *chap.* 30, 31. *Nehem.* 9.3. & 10. 1. from whence I collected, that without which they could not ſtand in a right church eſtate viſibly, that was the forme of that church; but without the renewall of their covenant they could not ſtand in a right or pure church eſtate, (but without renewall of circumciſion they might.) *Ergo.* His anſwer hereto is, Firſt, he grants they made a covenant, and did well in ſo doing; but ſecondly, that they could not be in a church eſtate without ſo doing, nor have I proved it, and he will prove the contrary; firſt, becauſe they were a church before; ſecondly, this covenant was but an animating them to doe that which they were engaged to doe before by their circumciſion, *Gal.* 5. 3. *Ergo.* As the renewall of their covenant is not by me proved to bee the form of the church then, much leſſe hath it any conſequence to prove that it is the form of a church now.

Reply. He denies not what I affirmed, to wit, that they could not ſtand in a right and pure church eſtate, without renewall of their covenant, hee denies that they could not ſtand in a church ſtate without it; and great difference there is, between a church and no church, a pure and impure church; he ſaith nothing therefore to what I ſaid and proved: yet I am willing to heare what he ſaith.

Firſt, they were a church before, and I ſay ſo too, but much degenerated, and much tranſgreſſing the covenant.

Secondly, he ſaith, they did no more then they were bound to doe by their circumciſion.

Reply. I have anſwered that, *Gal.* 5. before, that it did not engage them to keep the whole Law, it *being the ſeale of the righteouſneſſe of Faith,*

Faith, nor did the ſeale bind them to any thing but as in relation to the covenant, which onely bound them, Hence *Levit.* 26. where God threatned to ſend a ſword to avenge thequarrell of his covenant, he did not plead with them about circumciſion, but for not beleeving (circumciſion of the heart, as *Jerem.* 9. *laſt*) and teſtifying their faith by obedience, and ſo they did now mend this by attending to the covenant, and thereby ſetting themſelves viſibly in a right church ſtate again, which therefore proves that the forme of the church was a viſible covenant: for that which makes a church impure to be pure, according to the right conſtitution, that is it which gives it the conſtitution; but the renewall of the covenant maketh an impure church pure, according to the right conſtitution. *Ergo*, the covenant giveth it a conſtitution.

Again, if failing in the covenant cauſeth a true church to bee otherwiſe then according to conſtitution, then the covenant gives her her conſtitution: But the firſt is true. *Ergo* the latter; and circumciſion the ſeal, remains the ſame without any alteration. As in mens covenants the ſeale annexed remains the ſame, though the covenant to which it is adjoyned, may in many things be violated.

My fourth and laſt particular to prove a covenant acted by them as beleevers, was the forme of the Jewiſh church, was this; That which being taken away, made that church ceaſe to bee a church, that was the form of that church: But the diſſolving of their covenant made that church ceaſe to be a church. *Ergo*. The firſt Propoſition he meddles not with, and I raiſe it on this ground, That nothing can ceaſe to be that hath a being, but by annihilating the matter and form of its being; nor can any thing ceaſe to be that it is, but by taking away that form of it, whereby it is ſuch a thing rather then another. And therefore if any thing ceaſe to be that it was, it muſt be by taking away the form of it.

The ſecond Propoſition that the diſſolving of their covenant, made that church ceaſe to be a church, which I cleared from *Zach.* 11.10,14. take a view and you may ſee it clearly, the chapter declares the rejection of the Jewes from being a church (no man can deny it,) and that at Chriſts time, and for rejecting of him, and upon their rejection, they ceaſed to be a viſible church, and Gods people, as they had been.

Firſt, therefore, it is to be obſerved how God will effect this, that they ſhall be no church, nor his people, and that is by breaking his

covenant

covenant with them, verſ. 10. *That I may break my covenant which I had made with this people.*

Secondly, this covenant had two branches, one, *the ſtaffe of Beauty*, and this is the covenant between God and them mutually, called *Beauty*, becauſe God making a covenant with them, did adorne them with all excellencie and comelineſſe, whereby they became beautifull above other people, *Ezek.* 16. 8, &c. yea in the eyes of the Heathen, v. 14. which could not be circumciſion, nor any inviſible covenant, but outward and viſible. The other branch of the covenant is called *Bonds*, and that is the covenant on their parts one with another, whereby they joyned together in a brotherhood to worſhip God; called *Bonds*, becauſe they were thereby knit and bound together, to be a compact body and brotherhood Eccleſiaſticall.

Thirdly, that God by breaking theſe two ſtaves, did break his covenant with them, and thereby they ceaſed to be his viſible people, and a brotherhood amongſt themſelves: all theſe are evidently foretold in the Text, and accompliſhed after our Saviour his death, when they were wholly rejected of God, and never ſince enjoyed that eſtate. From whence it followeth plainly, that their conſtitution in that Church eſtate, was by that covenant, which being diſanulled, their Church eſtate, and conſtitution is altogether annihilated.

Now let us ſee what hee anſwers to this reaſon: Firſt, hee ſaith, the covenant of Gods grace is eternall; the Kingdome, or Church ſtate that comes by it, cannot be ſhaken, *Heb.* 12. 28. baptiſme the fruit of it, a church conſtituted by it, remaines eternally, *John* 11. 26. *He that beleeves in Chriſt, ſhall never die.*

Reply. Firſt, I grant that the covenant of grace is eternall, and that as well in the time before Chriſt, as ſince; but I ſpeak of it as it is made with men, in which reſpect though it bee eternall in it ſelfe, yet it is not eternall to all that it is made with, but may and doth ceaſe to this or that man, to this or that Church.

Secondly, the Kingdome ſhaken, and that cannot be ſhaken, is not the covenant of grace applied to the Jews or Gentiles, but the manner of adminiſtration of one and the ſame covenant in it ſelfe, but from the divers adminiſtration of it, one way to them, the old Teſtament, another way to us, now the new Teſtament; the former is ſhaken and removed, and changed into this, that cannot be ſhaken or changed, but ſhall remain till Chriſts coming, 1 *Cor.* 15. yet this

or

or that church may be ſhaken out of it, and many have been, and that this ſhaking is meant of the former manner of adminiſtration only, is evident by the Scripture it ſelf, and not of the covenant, elſe the covenant with them was not the eternall covenant of grace, but a covenant of another nature; this particular church therefore may be diſanulled, yet the covenant remains eternall and unſhaken. Again, the kingdome of Heaven is taken two wayes in Scripture:

Firſt, as before, for the manner of adminiſtration of the covenant, and ſo it may be, and hath been ſhaken, and of this, *Heb.* 12.

Secondly, for the church-eſtate, and the covenant of grace by laying hold whereon a people became a church. This can never be ſhaken ſo, as that there ſhould not be a viſible church viſibly in covenant with God; and of this, *Matth.* 21. 43. which may be taken from one company and given to another: (as from the *Jewes* to the *Gentiles*) but never ceaſe to be with one people or other, hells gate being not able to prevail againſt it, *Matth.* 16.

Thirdly, baptiſme, the fruit of it, or church-eſtate, by partaking thereof (not by baptiſme, but by the covenant) is eternall to all the elect; and ſo hee that believeth in Chriſt ſhall never die, but theſe are not eternall to any elſe at all (for reprobate members dying, remain not members, &c.) ſo that here is nothing in this anſwer that proveth the *Jewes* were not a church-eſtate by an acted covenant.

Secondly, he anſwereth, the covenant is a ground of a churches being a viſible church, that the viſible participation in the covenant, is by ſome viſible thing, which was circumciſion then, is baptiſme now; other viſible participations there was not, nor is any; therefore by circumciſion then and baptiſme now, they are a viſible church. And as the taking away of the covenant cauſeth the church to ceaſe; ſo it cauſeth their circumciſion and baptiſme to ceaſe alſo, whereby they had viſible participation in the covenant and church.

Reply. Firſt he ſaith, a covenant is the ground of a viſible, (for the queſtion, ſaith he, ſpeaks of a viſible church) and ſo ſay I, and a viſible ground of any mans being circumciſed then, or baptized now; if it be a ground of a viſible church, then a church cannot be a church without it, and ſo conſtituted a viſible church by it.

Secondly, there muſt be ſome viſible thing whereby a man may have viſible participation in the covenant, I grant it; but, ſaith he, there is no other viſible thing whereby any are partakers of the covenant, but circumciſion then, and baptiſme now; I deny it, and affirm

affirm there is ſome viſible thing preceding circumciſion, then baptiſme now: For when they baptize a man, do they baptize him as out of covenant or in it? If in covenant, then it is as hee is inviſibly in it, or viſibly, not inviſibly, that they cannot know; therefore viſibly by ſomething they can diſcern and know, and upon that baptize him, and that is the profeſſion of his faith in the covenant, which as it muſt go before baptiſme, ſo it makes him partaker viſibly of the covenant before he be baptized or circumciſed; therefore circumcifion then, baptiſme now is not the only viſible participation in the covenant, nor indeed any participation at all; but a viſible ſign and ſeal of his viſible participation: and this appeareth further from the deſcription of a Sacrament, an outward and viſible ſign of an inward and ſpirituall grace which muſt be there, or the outward is not to be applied; but it cannot be concluded to be there, but by ſome outward evidence, therefore ſomething viſible, and thereby viſible participation in the covenant muſt go before viſible baptiſme: As then the covenant muſt be taken away before the church ceaſe to be a church, and not circumciſion nor baptiſme, which cannot ceaſe untill the church ceaſeth (all which himſelf granteth) ſo as long as any continue viſible profeſſion of faith, ſo long the covenant continueth and viſible profeſſion muſt ceaſe before the covenant ceaſeth in reſpect of men; *Ergo*, by viſible profeſſion of faith in the covenant is obtained and declared viſible participation in the covenant, and ſo is the church-eſtate conſtituted thereby.

Further, hee ſaith, the covenant before Chriſt, did ceremonially lead to Chriſt, and in that reſpect is diſſolved, and circumciſion by which they had participation in that covenant is diſſolved; and therfore the viſible church ceaſed, as was propheſied, *Zach.* 11. and accompliſhed at the death of Chriſt, the partition wall being broken down, *Epheſ.* 2. 13, *&c.* the covenant ſince Chriſt ratified by the death of the teſtator, cannot be diſſolved, (as I affirm in my third Propoſition and fourth poriod,) and ſo baptiſme by which they have true viſible being in the covenant cannot be removed, nor the viſible church-ſtate.

Reply. Here is nothing ſaid that hath not been ſaid before, again and again, and ſo anſwered; yet in a word:

Firſt, hee confoundeth covenant and teſtament, there is but one covenant, but yet two Teſtaments, and the covenant was diſpenſed to *Abraham*, before there was any teſtament inſtituted, and the

Scriptures that ſpeake of aboliſhing the old, and eſtabliſhing the new, are not to be underſtood of two covenants, (there being but one) but of two Teſtaments, as I ſhewed in my third Propoſition, and fourth period; and he much miſtakes himſelf, abuſeth his Reader, and cannot but know that he ſpeakes not truly, in ſaying I affirmed the new covenant cannot be removed, when as I ſaid, the new Teſtament cannot be removed.

Secondly, the covenant before Chriſt did not ceremonially lead to Chriſt; for the covenant alwayes (from *Adam*) held forth Chriſt, the ſame yeſterday, to day and for ever; but the old Teſtament before Chriſt, did ceremonially lead to Chriſt, and was aboliſhed at Chriſts coming, that the new confirmed by his blood might be eſtabliſhed.

Thirdly, the covenant and viſible church-ſtate thereby did not ceaſe at Chriſts coming in it ſelf, but was taken away from the *Jews*, and given to the *Gentiles*, and that not becauſe the covenant and church-eſtate typified Chriſt, but becauſe they believed not; for had they believed, they ſhould have injoyed the covenant and church-ſtate ſtill (though the old Teſtament ſhould have ceaſed, and the new be put in the room) and now it ſhall be taken from ſuch *Gentiles* ſo oft as any of them ceaſe to believe, as is already fallen out to many churches. Yet without any prejudice to the covenant of God or viſible church-eſtate which ever remain.

Laſt of all, I have ſhewed before, that circumciſion did not give them a viſible being in that covenant and church-eſtate; nor baptiſme us, but outward profeſſion of ſubjection to the covenant gave them, and gives us a being in the covenant and viſible church-ſtate, circumciſion then, and baptiſme now being but ſignes and ſeals of it.

Further, againſt his concluſion, that the true viſible church, in reſpect of the ground of it, cannot be removed or diſſolved, he putteth two exceptions, and ſeeks to cleer it from them.

The firſt is this: The true Church may poſſibly die, and none ſurvive them in that eſtate; *Ergo*, the true Church may ceaſe to be: His anſwer to this is, the true Chrch ceaſeth to be, but only to our outward view, for to our faith it is no more ceaſed then their relation to the covenant ceaſeth, which doth not ceaſe to the faithfull when they die, but it remains as the covenant it ſelf, which is as firm as God that made it.

Secondly, as their outward view to the church ceaſeth ſo their relation

relation to the church by baptiſme ceaſeth, by which they had viſible participation with the body of Chriſt, therefore the exception hinders not, but that the true viſible Church remains undiſſolved.

Reply. Whether this were mine or no, I cannot ſay, as alſo many other things, the which hee puts forth in my name; a word or two:

Firſt, he changeth the State of the Queſtion, ſpeaking of a viſible ſtate, whereas he ſpeaketh of an inviſible ſtate, and of the elect only, whereas himſelf will confeſſe, that many may be in a viſible, with whom the covenant ceaſeth, and church-eſtate when they die, if it ceaſe not before.

Secondly, this or that true viſible church may die, and none ſucceed them, and then the viſible church ceaſeth for ever, the outward covenant alſo, and baptiſme the ſeal of it ceaſeth, and that not only to the outward view, but to our faith alſo: For I ſuppoſe none have ſo much faith, as to believe that a company of dead men, and ceaſing to be, are a viſible church in covenant, and baptized; that they were ſuch may be believed, but that they are ſuch, and hold their relation ſtill, with the viſible church by their baptiſme, as members thereof, is but his dream, as any that are dead and ſaved may be accounted a part of a church, it is of the church predeſtinate from all ages, from the beginning to the end; a part whereof are in heaven triumphant, and a part on earth militant; and otherwiſe to make them in heaven a part of any church, or of this or that viſible church, is but a deviſed thing: Nor doth it follow, that this or that viſible church ceaſing, and none ſurviving; *Ergo*, the viſible Church of Chriſt ceaſeth; ſo this his exception might have been ſpared: Nor doth his anſwer cleer his Propoſition from it, but it is wholly overthrown thereby.

A ſecond exception is this; perſons may ſeem to be true members of a viſible church, and yet not be ſo, and may ſhew themſelves not to be afterwards, and ſo the church may ceaſe.

He anſwereth, that when ſuch do maniſeſt themſelves what they are, they declare thereby, that they never were in covenant, nor church at all, nor baptized: So the church thereby ceaſe not to be by being diſſolved; but they are diſcovered never to have been in that covenant nor church, and ſo never were baptized, 1 *Joh.* 2. 19.

Reply. This exception ſavoureth of himſelf, but briefly, where hypocrites diſcover themſelves to be ſuch, they thereby declare they

never were of the number of Gods elect, and ſo not in the covenanted viſible church, and baptized as the elect of God; but that they were not truly members of that viſible church to which they belonged, in the covenant, and truly baptized is not true, but croſſe to Scriptures affirming ſuch to be branches in the Vine, *Joh.* 15. (or elſe now cut off) and members of the church, as in the Epiſtles to the churches in *Aſia*, &c. And if ſuch an hypocrite, after his diſcovery ſhould repent, and be truly converted, then he muſt be joyned to the church, not by reſtoring, but by a new covenant, and be new baptized, having no covenant, baptiſme, or memberſhip before; for that place, 1 *John* 2. 19. it doth not ſay they went out from us, becauſe they were not with us, (for how could they have gone out from them if not with them, and really with them, or elſe they ſeemingly went out from them) but becauſe they were not of us, that they might be made manifeſt that they were not of us, the Text therefore doth not deny them to be truly members with them viſibly, but they were not true members of them; ſo that all hee hath ſaid, doth not wave the exception: From all which it doth appeare, that baptiſme (even of God himſelf) cannot be the form of a church, but only it is a ſeal of the covenant by which the church is conſtituted: it is conſtituted by paticipation, and viſibly by viſible paticipation, and that is only by viſible and outward acting to ſubjection in the covenant: the continuance alſo in a church is by the continuance of the manifeſtation of the ſame participation poſſeſſed, their viſilbe profeſſion of ſubjection to the covenant; therefore baptiſme of believers is not the conſtitution of church viſible, but a covenant acted, as from all theſe four particulars Largued, gathered up into this ſumme: If a covenant acted by believers was the form of the viſible church before Chriſt, then it is the form of viſible churches ſince Chriſt; but the firſt is true, (as will appeare by all theſe four particulars) therefore alſo the latter.

This he anſwereth by denying both Antecedent and Conſequent, his Reaſon againſt the Antecedent is, becauſe if God himſelf was not the form of the church of the old Teſtament, much leſſe can it be ſaid that an outward covenant acted by the people of *Iſrael* was the form of the church, as is manifeſted by what is above ſaid; his Reaſon of denying the Conſequent is leaſt of all, nor doth it prove ſuch a thing to form the churches now.

Reply. This Reaſon of denying the Antecedent is not reaſonable; for

for what was the covenant of God himſelfe, but an outward covenant acted between God and the people of Iſrael? I know no other covenant of God, but that which he made with *Abraham* between *Abraham* and his ſeed, and himſelfe, which was alſo continued to his poſterity; and that covenant was acted between God and them, and one with another (and ſo the form of that Church) is evident from the former four particulars conſidered together, notwithſtanding all that he hath ſaid to the contrary.

The covenant God made with *Abraham* his family and ſeed, was an outward acted covenant, the renewall of which by them in the plains of *Moab*, was ſuch; ſo was that in *Aſa's*, *Joſiah's*, *Nehemiah's* dayes, all theſe were outward and viſible covenants, acted outwardly. Of this covenant under which the Jewes ſtood, doth *Zacharias* ſpeak, *Zach.* 11.10.14.

This *Zachary* ſhewes how it was in two branches, *the ſtaffe of Beauty* acted betwixt God and them, and *the ſtaffe of Bonds* acted between themſelves to be a brotherhood, by which title a Chriſtian Church is frequently ſtiled in the new Teſtament: by all which it appeares, that it was ſuch a covenant ſpoken off, by which they were Gods people and church, and by the diſſolution whereof, they were no Church. Beſides, there was a viſible Church from *Adams* reſtitution till *Abrahams* time, by their profeſſion of faith in Gods righteouſneſſe, and neither circumciſion nor baptiſme, yet a true conſtituted viſible Church, out of which *Cain* was ejected and caſt out. The conſequent from hence is this, That a covenant outwardly acted by beleevers, with God and one another, is the form of the viſible Churches in the new Teſtament, becauſe it was the form of the Church before Chriſt, and there can bee but one form of one and the ſame thing: as a man grown, and a child, is but the ſame man, and hath the ſame form that makes him a man now when he is grown, that he had when he was a child. Even ſo the church before Chriſt is compared to a child under age, and churches ſince Chriſt, to grown men, *Gal.* 4.1, &c. Further, to prove that we have the ſame Church eſtate (not in number but in kind,) I alledged, *Matth.* 21.43. where it is ſaid, *The Kingdome of Heaven ſhall be taken from them, and given to another Nation*, that Church eſtate was not diſſolved, but taken away from them (*Heb.* 12. ſpeakes not of the covenant as Church eſtate, but of the manner of adminiſtration, as I have ſhewed before, a Kingdome is not to be

taken

taken there in the ſenſe that it is here in *Matthew*) it ceaſed to them, but was not diſſolved in it ſelf, nor in reſpect of others to whom it was given, not another Kingdome and Church eſtate given to others diverſe from that, but the very ſame.

So *Matth.* 22. 1, &c. the marriage Supper in one and the ſame continued all the time of that church eſtate before Chriſt, and in theſe churches ſince Chriſt.

They were invited and called from time to time, but they would not come, at laſt they were therfore deſtroyed, & the Gentiles called in their ſtead: therfore that then and this now was but one covenant, and the ſame church eſtate, the form of it then and now the ſame, which then was an outward and viſible covenant, acted between God and the people mutually; and therefore this ſame is the forme of churches now.

Having paſſed through the Argument which I gathered out of the old Teſtament, I next added ſome others, and firſt from *Mat.* 18. 20. where the word uſed in the *Greek*, is commonly uſed for church aſſembling, or Synagoguiſing taken from the Jewes, whoſe aſſemblies, and places of aſſembling, were called Synagogues, *John* 20: 10. *Acts* 4. 21. & 11. 26. & 13. 44. & 14. 27. & 20. 7. 1 *Cor.* 5. 4. & 11. 18, &c. and other places many, though ſome by him ſet downe, are miſquoted. His anſwere hereto was this, that the aſſembling of perſons meerly in the Scripture, was not the cauſe of that denomination, nor will any Scripture prove, that that name *Church* is given to a company of unbaptized perſons, but the aſſembling of a company of perſons baptized in Chriſts name, is the reaſon why they are denominated a true viſible Church.

Rep. I grant, that according to the intent of the queſtion, that the aſſembling of a company of men unbaptized, is not the occaſion why they are denominated a church (yet the word ἐκκλησία is generally applied to a company of unbaptized perſons, as *Act.* 19. 31. 39. 41. thrice together, but that a church ſo meeting, is of baptized perſons; yet the reaſon why a company of baptized perſons meeting together, is called a Church, is truely and onely becauſe they meet together, and that not accidentally (for ſo many thouſands meet together in one place) becauſe they conſtantly meet together in one place by agreement to performe the ſolemne duties which they are bound to perform to God and each other. Such a meeting together is that which onely giveth them the denomination of a

Church,

Church, nor is baptiſme any reaſon of their meeting together: for then all baptized perſons muſt meet together in one place; nor could this or that compaſſy bee called a church for that reaſon, much leſſe ſeverall companies churches, if there were nothing elſe added, *Matth.* 18. 19. *Whatſoever two of you ſhall agree together in*: where the word agree is properly by a conſent manifeſted by concurring voyces, and paction ſo uſed, *Matth.* 20. 2. 13. To ſay no more to this (though I might ſay much more,) becauſe I am not privie to my ſelfe that it was uſed by me, I come to the next reaſon, which was, That whatſoever maketh a man a member of a church, or no member; that makes a company of men to be a church or no church (there is the ſame reaſon of the whole, that there is of every part;) but the making or unmaking, or reſtoring a man to bee a member, is by a covenant acted, *Eſay* 56. 4, 6. *Ergo*, that is the form of the church.

His anſwer grants, that the covenant of God is the ground upon which the church and every member thereof is ſtated; but hee denies that a covenant acted to become one another, doe form the church or member either; nor doth *Eſa.* 56. 4, 5. prove any ſuch thing, but onely that the Eunuch or ſtranger that took hold of Gods covenant, that is, were circumciſed, and performed the duties, which they were thereby bound to performe, *Gal.* 5. 3. ſhould have a place in his houſe, not by acting a covenant, and neglecting circumciſion.

Reply. What he ſaith here, hath been ſaid before and anſwered, and I am confident, that he cannot make good what hee grants, that a Church is grounded upon Gods covenant, and thereby ſtated; but in this ſenſe I ſpeak of a covenant acted by beleevers between God and them (which he alwayes leaves out) and between themſelves; and therefore a covenant acted doth form the church or membership therof, *Eſay* 56. doth prove it ſufficiently, where the Lord ſaith, *If an Eunuch or ſtranger ſhall take hold of, and embrace my covenant*, that is, ſhall ſubmit themſelves to enter into covenant with me, taking me to be their God, and becomming one of my people, by joyning themſelves to me and them thereby, and receive circumciſion as a ſeale thereof, *and doe my works, ſhall have a place in my houſe*; whereas he expoundeth the covenant to be circumciſion, hee doth but run in a common miſtake, it being but a ſigne & ſeale of the covenant, and cannot be the covenant it ſelfe, no more then a ſigne or

ſeale

ſeale of a thing can be the thing it ſelfe that it ſignifieth and ſealeth: and is not onely an errour in religion, but againſt manifeſt reaſon too. But of this often before, though therefore they were to be circumciſed, yet that was the firſt thing before which there was nothing acted viſibly, and that they did not firſt make ſome outward profeſſion and expreſſion of being one with them, and having their God to be theirs, will never be proved by him; and if he will not yeeld the contrary by what is and hath been ſaid, let him bee content that other men be of another judgement, and have his leave to be quiet, or elſe convince me of his calling hee hath to deale in ſuch matters as he doth, with arrogancy enough. He addeth, not by acting a covenant, neglecting circumciſion. I grant it, and ſo alſo, not by acting a covenant, or circumciſion, and neglecting ſacrifices, &c. but acting a covenant doth form the church, and giveth them right to circumciſion, and the reſt, which muſt be added, or elſe they will be found deſpiſers of Gods covenant, which they had made, whereby they were bound to obſerve circumciſion, and all other appointments of God before they were circumciſed, as is manifeſt in all them that lived before *Abrahams* dayes, and in *Abrahams* dayes, by Gods expreſſing himſelfe to *Abraham*, *Gen.* 12, 13. 15. chapters, which was before hee was circumciſed. As for that, *Gal.* 5. 3. it hath been fully anſwered before, and therefore I omit it.

My next reaſon was taken from the compariſon of a church with a Candleſtick, *Rev.* 1. 12. 20. ſuch as is the forme of a candleſtick, ſuch by proportion is the form of a church (as the matter ſignifies the matter of a church proportionally;) but the form of the candleſtick is the joyning together of the ſhaft and branches, ſignifying the uniting together of many members and Chriſt, which cannot be but by agreement, and covenant. *Ergo*, a covenant acted is the form of a church.

His anſwer firſt granteth the compariſon, and proportion alſo. But ſecondly, denies that a covenant acted by beleevers, or agreement mutually, is neceſſary to form the church to be one body, and concludes, that perſons may be united to Chriſt by faith and baptiſme, and ſo ſtated in the covenant of grace, and members of the viſible church, proportionally, as the form of the candleſtick is the joyning together of the ſhaft and branches.

Reply. Firſt, where he denies mutuall agreement, or a covenant acted,

acted, is the forme of the church, hee doth it without any reaſon given, which is an eaſie way of confuting; for where he ſaith it may be by faith and baptiſm, he ſhould prove it is, and muſt be, or elſe he ſhewes himſelf to heare himſelf ſpeak.

Secondly, in ſaying faith in Chriſt, and baptiſme may unite them to Chriſt, and ſo ſtate them in the covenant of grace. I affirm faith alone doth it: But it is faith profeſſed, that may make a man capable of baptiſme, in thoſe that they themſelves will admit members; and therefore it muſt be faith profeſſed that unites a man to Chriſt viſibly, and ſo he is a member of Chriſt viſibly before baptiſme comes; nor could be baptized without that viſible union, and therefore hee is not made a viſible member of Chriſt by baptiſme, but is ſo before.

Thirdly, though by faith profeſſed a man is viſibly united to Chriſt, and may be ſo acknowledged; yet this doth not unite him or make him a member of this or that particular church, but there muſt be ſomething whereby he may be united to this or that church, and make him a member thereof, rather then of another; baptiſme doth not ſo make him, for then all baptized ſhould be of one and the ſame church, and not of *Epheſus* more then of *Smyrna*; nor can they be any other things then mutuall agreement or covenant acted, as we know it to be certain in all conſociations, a mutuall covenant is the bond and form of them, as in marriage, common-wealths, 2. *Rev.* 17. 21. and ſo of other ſocieties and bodies incorporate: ſo alſo in this myſticall body of Chriſt, a church viſible being an Eccleſiaſticall body politike, conſiſting of many members conſociated, it muſt needs be by covenant acted mutually; and by this compariſon of marrying, the Apoſtle ſets forth the relation of Chriſt and the Church, the bond tying the members each to other, that uniteth them all to the head, which is a marriage covenant, *Epheſ.* 5. baptiſme being but the ſeal of it: And thus wee are come to the laſt Argument.

If the removing of the candleſtick, and ſo unchurching of a church be by diſſolving the covenant and their fellowſhip, (as to them by diſſipation, *Zach.* 11.) then a covenant acted is the form of a viſible church: But the removing of the candleſtick is the diſſolving the covenant and their fellowſhip thereby (as to them by diſſipation:) *Ergo*, a covenant acted is the form of it.

To the ſecond Propoſition hee anſwereth two things:

Firſt, becauſe the covenant in the new Teſtament eſtabliſhed in

Chriſts blood is everlaſting, and cannot be ſhaken and diſſolved, and differ from the covenant which was before Chriſt, which was ſhaken, diſſolved and taken away, therefore their kingdome of Heaven was ſhaken, and church-eſtate was taken away; but the kingdome and church-ſtate now cannot be taken away, *Heb.* 12. 27. *Matth.* 21. 43.

Reply. Here is nothing which is not ſaid before and anſwered; yet obſerve that he declines the true queſtion, which is of a viſible church, and flies to the inviſible ſtate; for to viſible churches there is an end many times of their viſible ſtate, and yet the covenant of God remains eternall to all the elect of God, and never is taken away from them; nor indeed is the viſible kingdome of Chriſt altogether taken away, but it hath, and doth remain ſome where upon earth, though many particular churches are often ruinated and deſtroyed. Again, he ſpeaks to the ſtate before Chriſt, and the difference of this ſince Chriſt; whereas the Propoſition ſpeaks of this ſince Chriſt only: and the argument is taken from the ſtate of churches ſince Chriſt, as the expreſſions fully declare, *Rev.* 2. & 3. where churches compared to candleſticks are threatened diſſolution for their faults, *Epheſus*, *Rev.* 2. 5. *I will remove thy candleſtick*, that is, I will make thee no church: *Rev.* 3. 16. *I will ſpue thee out of my mouth*; noting an utter undoing of them: and an alluſion was made to *Zach.* 11. to intimate the way how God would unchurch them, not by taking away their baptiſme, but by deſtroying them, and diſſipating their fellowſhip in the covenant; nor was that of *Zachary* any part of the argument that hee could have, nor advantage from that to fetch in the ſtate of the old Teſtament in his anſwer: And whereas I ſay the deſtruction of the church of *Epheſus* or *Laodicea*, was not by taking away their baptiſme from them; ſo that who ſo remains alive of them at the time of diſſipation, ſhould not be accounted baptized perſons (having received baptiſme, though it will do them no good in the ſtate they are in) for let me put this caſe, a whole church is diſſipated and unchurched, yet one or two of them that live ſtill after a few dayes, are truly converted from their hypocriſie and apoſtaſie, juſtifying the Lord, and ſeeking, the one to joyn to *Philadelphia*, the other to *Smyrna*, and each give ſuch ſatisfaction to the church of their faith, and repentance, as they dare not deny the right hand of fellowſhip: Shall theſe two be now anew baptized, having received true baptiſme before, whileſt they

they were members of *Epheſus* before ſhee was deſtroyed? If any ſhall ſay as hee did before in his anſwer to the firſt Reaſon againſt baptiſme, being the form of the church, that all before being but ſeeming, was nothing indeed; and ſo account he was not baptized at all, and never had any capacity of being baptized truly till now: Beſides, what hath been replied there, I adde, that the ſame ſtate muſt be then of a man that is a member, but an hypocrite in the church unknown ſo to be, who in continuance of time by Gods Spirit in the Word, is convinced of his unſound eſtate; repents of it, manifeſts this to the church, and ſo cleers it, that the church is ſatisfied, that ſhe was before miſtaken, and he was but ſeemingly a believer, and ſo had but a ſeeming membership and baptiſme; I ſay likewiſe, that this man alſo muſt be baptized, if he were not before truly baptized: And how fearfull a thing is it thus to dally in Gods matters, and to make Gods ordinance deſcend upon our apprehenſion, to be or not to be: *humanus intellectus non eſt menſura inſtitutionum Dei*, the ordinance adminiſtred to ſuch a man before, was Gods ordinance, and true baptiſme, but he did not receive it ſavingly, which now upon this work of grace he doth; and baptiſme in it ſelf applied unto him is not truer baptiſme now then it was before, it proves only unto him more profitable: But I go on further, where he ſaith the covenant before Chriſt might be, and was diſſolved, ſhaken, and removed; this covenant ſince Chriſt cannot be diſſolved, ſhaken, or removed. All may eaſily ſee, that either wilfully or ignorantly hee confoundeth covenant and teſtament, which are divers things: for the kingdome before Chriſt ſpoken of, *Heb.* 12. is not the covenant, but manner of adminiſtration; that before Chriſt the old Teſtament, to be ſhaken and removed; this ſince Chriſt the new Teſtament eſtabliſhed, and never to be ſhaken, nor removed; and this kingdome ſhaken, was not taken away from the *Jewes* and given to the *Gentiles*, but utterly aboliſhed, and a new kingdome given and ſet up that ſhall not be aboliſhed, nor end, till Chriſt ſhall give it up to the Father, 1 *Cor.* 15. Laſt of all, the covenant before Chriſt was the eternall covenant of God and remains the ſame for ever, and cannot be ſhaken; this covenant God made with *Abraham* continued to the *Jewes* till Chriſts time, and this alſo is called the kingdome of God, *Matth.* 27. 34. which cannot be altered, nor was it diſanulled nor aboliſhed then, but only taken away from the *Jewes* (whereas kingdome in the other ſenſe

was utterly aboliſhed) and given to the *Gentiles*, and a new or another, but the ſame; and therefore, though the *Jewiſh* people were cut off, yet the covenant and church-ſtate remained and was given to the *Gentiles*, yet ſo as that many of the *Gentile* churches have been cut off, and may be, and ſhall be cut off for the ſame cauſe that the *Jewes* were cut off, (*viz.*) if they continue not in faith, *Rom.* 11.

His ſecond anſwer is this, the removing of the candleſticks, and unchurching of them is only by diſcovery or manifeſtation of a people to be void of any participation in the covenant, which formerly they profeſſed, were eſteemed, and had a name to have, 1 *John* 2. 19. *Rev.* 3. 1. and not diſſolving or taking away of covenant which once they had and enjoyed; much leſſe is it a diſſolving of an outward covenant acted by believers; ſuch a covenant is will-worſhip, and the churches conſtituted thereby meerly Antichriſtian; the diſſolving of ſuch a covenant cannot be the unchurching of any true churches; Jeſus Chriſt having no true viſible church ſo conſtituted.

Reply. All hath been ſaid and anſwered before that here hee ſpeaks; yet a word here: If the removing of the candleſtick, and unchurching of ſuch be nothing but only a diſcovery that they were in no covenant before, then the *Jewes* before Chriſt were in no covenant, but only ſeemed to be ſo, *&c.* *Epheſus* and the reſt were in no covenant, but had a name only to be in it, who are long ago rejected; nor were the Saints in *Rome* graffed branches into the true Olive, but only were eſteemed ſo to be; and the cutting, breaking off, diſſolving of all thoſe and the like, is but a declaration, and manifeſt diſcovery that they were never in covenant; and what great puniſhment is it for theſe and the like, to have that taken away from them which they never had? But I doubt not, but that all that have any judgement to diſcerne of things aright, will eaſily ſee, as the unſoundneſſe, ſo the unreaſonableneſſe of what hee ſaith.

Secondly, the places alledged by him are not to his purpoſe; the firſt not ſpeaking of their memberſhip and ſtate in the covenant which they had and departed from, but of the ſoundneſſe of their ſtate therein, and of ſaving grace from the Father, election in Chriſt, which they had not, and hereby manifeſted that they had not, in that they departed from the fellowſhip of faith. The other place, *Rev.* 3, ſpeaks not of them as having a name to be a church, for that they were, and Chriſt ſo called them, and would not have

ſo

ſo acknowledged them, had they not ſo been; but it ſpeaks of the condition they were in in this church-eſtate, as having a name to be alive in faith and holineſſe, but indeed were in this reſpect dead, and yet not quite dead, but almoſt; and therefore are bidden to ſtrengthen the things that are ready to die: theſe places therefore do not at all ſpeak of their being in covenant, or church-eſtate, but only of the unſoundneſſe of their eſtate in faith and godlineſſe.

Thirdly, whereas he oppoſeth a covenant, and a covenant acted by believers, as divers things, or contrary, if hee underſtood himſelf, hee ſhould have done well to expreſſe himſelf what he meant by them both, that others might underſtand him: For can there be a covenant, and not outwardly acted? Is not a covenant between two parties? Or is it a covenant unleſſe all parties agree? there is no covenant of God, but it is outwardly manifeſted to men, and by viſible means made known to ſuch as hee would have to be in it; nor is that a covenant made with them, but as they outwardly receive it, and by ſome viſible act anſwer the Lord therein, and ſo make themſelves partakers thereof, and viſibly by viſible participation, which cannot be but by acting or paſſing conſent to the covenant, whereby God and they become one anothers, and they viſibly Gods people, which being once done, they remain a church and Gods people as long as this ſtate continues, and when it ceaſeth, then they ceaſe to be Gods people, forſaking each other again mutually, which alſo is further evident, in that God uſeth this expreſſion to note out his diſſolution, giving them a bill of divorcement, and ſo diſſolving that marriage covenant, which they were joyned together in, *Jerem.* 13. I cannot but therefore conclude, that hee doth ſpeak unchriſtianly, in ſaying an outward covenant acted by a company of believers, is will-worſhip, and churches ſo conſtituted are Antichriſtian; or the diſſolving of ſuch a covenant cannot be the unchurching of any true churches, becauſe Jeſus Chriſt hath no other true viſible churches, but thoſe only that are ſo conſtituted.

A Discourse of the Verity and Validity of Infants Baptisme in it selfe considered:

As also it hath been administred in the Church of ENGLAND.

WHEREIN,

Besides the Arguments duly propounded, and clearly explained for the proofe thereof, occasionally: The calling of the Ministers in England, and here administring that ordinance;

Likewise the manner of administring it by sprinkling and not dipping, is handled and justified.

AS it hath ever been the fruit of Satans malice to pervert the right wayes of the Lord, and if not utterly to abolish, yet greatly to corrupt the worship and ordinances of God: So there have never wanted men of evill minds, who give themselves to promote his sinfull designes. A proofe whereof beyond exception, is, that man of Sin, with all that Apostasie, wherein the prevailing efficacie of Satan is not so much to be wondred at, as the severe judgement of God is to bee adored, who thereby punisheth the wanton spirits of men, giving them up to make and beleeve lies, because they receive not the truth in the love of it. And no lesse is his mercy to be admired to these latter times, in dispensing from heaven such beames of light and grace, as hee hath thereby enlightned the horrid darkenesse which overspreads the world, and put many upon reformation of what they saw amisse; yet here again, Satan envying our good, by his wiles and subtiltie hath prevailed, that some have not gone so farre as the light revealed called for at their hands. And some making more haste then good speed, have gone beyond the truth in many things,

so

ſo that there is ſcarce any truth of God that the adverſary attempts not to vilifie, nor any ordinance which ſuffers not prejudice by ſome or other. To reckon particulars would bee over tedious, my intentions being bounded in reſpect of that ordinance of Baptiſme, then which there is ſcarce any part of Chriſtianity more ſophiſticated and mangled. It deeply therefore concerneth all that love the common truth, or have a care of their own ſalvation, to try all things, and to hold faſt that which is good: To lay a ſure foundation, and be underſtandingly principled in theſe neceſſary matters, that they may be able to ſtand faſt; and having done all, to obtain the happy iſſue of all, *Eternall life.*

In Baptiſme it ſelf I know nothing reſpecting the eſſence or rites belonging to the eſſence which is not contradicted by ſome or other. I ſhall now ſpeak of the perſons baptizing, and to bee baptized. And to this purpoſe, firſt, concerning the perſons baptizing. This is a queſtion, To whom the right and power to adminiſter doth belong: Whether the power and authority to baptize be not common and promiſcuous, that any one may not baptize, or bee proper onely to ſuch as be called to labour in word and doctrine: And that it is unlawfull to any elſe to adminiſter it. Here men bee diſtracted into parts. Firſt, ſome maintaine, that in caſe of neceſſity, not onely an Officer, though but a Deacon; but he that is no Officer, if baptized; yea, though unbaptized, if they can ſpeak the words, and know the rites and order: And not onely a man, but a woman alſo may baptize, if a man cannot be procured.

To prove theſe concluſions, many Arguments are preſſed. Firſt, *Zippora's* example. Secondly the 28. of *Matthew*, *Goe, teach all Nations, &c.* Though the words be ſpoken to the Apoſtles, and their Succeſſours, yet to teach is lawfull to all; yea, in caſe of neceſſitie, all are bound to teach, as *Aquila* and *Priſcilla.* So alſo, though to baptize belong chiefly to Miniſters, yet in caſe of neceſſity, others, no Miniſters, may baptize; yea, and with greater reaſon, becauſe it belonged more to the Apoſtles to preach, then to baptize, 1 *Cor.* 1. 17. Thirdly, *Acts* 8. *Philip* baptized the Eunuch, *chap.* 9. *Ananias* baptized *Paul*, neither of them were Apoſtles, or Paſtors.

There being yet no Paſtor ordained beſides the Apoſtles: So *Acts* 10. *Peter* commanded them to be baptized of ſome brethren that went with him, which were neither Apoſtles nor Deacons.

Finally, *Acts* 2. three thouſand were baptized on the day of Pentecoſt.

Pentecoſt. This could not fitly be done by the Apoſtles alone, therefore ſome body elſe muſt help them, and theſe muſt needs be *Laici*, private men.

Fourthly, from congruence, becauſe Baptiſme is of chiefeſt neceſſity in reſpect of all men, therefore it was expedient that the adminiſtration of it ſhould be committed to all, eſpecially in caſe of neceſſity. The matter alſo is common, and eaſie to bee had every where, the adminiſtration conſiſts in a moſt ſimple action and words: Therefore it was convenient that the Miniſter of it ſhould be very common, and to be granted to every one.

Fifthly, from humane teſtimony, *Tertull. de Baptiſmo, Laicis jus eſt baptizandi, quod enim ex æquo accipitur, ex æquo datur: Alexander* confirming and ratifying the act of *Athanaſius*, a Laick, and a boy, adminiſtring baptiſme to boyes in ſport. The *Nicene* Councell ratified the baptiſme of heretickes, but they could have no true Office. *Concilium Elivertin.*

To anſwer theſe Arguments briefly: Firſt, in generall; not one of theſe places, or conſiderations will prove an unbaptized perſon may baptize; becauſe all their inſtances are of perſons circumciſed, or baptized, or in church eſtate, and therefore argue not that part of the reſolution of the queſtion given.

In particular to each: Firſt, to the inſtance of *Zippora*, it was not limited to any by any word of God to circumciſe: there were none appointed to perform this ordinance, as in other caſes afterwards; and in this, from the firſt inſtitution: and therefore it might be lawfull for her or any other to doe it, but it followes not that it may be ſo in this.

Secondly, it was a ſingular and extraordinary practiſe, and therefore the conſequence is nōt ſound: for not one inſtance more can be given, and it was extraordinary, in extream caſe of neceſſity; whereas there is not the like caſe fallen out. For it was not to prevent the childs dying uncircumciſed, but to prevent the dying of her husband, who had neglected the command, and was in danger of death, by Gods hand.

Thirdly, the caſe of neceſſity pleaded for it nothing ſo: for where doth the Lord ſay, that an unbaptized perſon ſhall bee cut off from his people? And there is as great neceſſitie to eate the Lords Supper, *John* 6. as ſome expound it, yet children have not that.

Laſt

Laſt of all, *Zippora* did it in preſence of her husband, therefore it will as well prove that a woman may baptize *præſente Preſbytero.*

To the ſecond, from *Matth.*28. This may as well prove, that they may doe any thing elſe as well as baptize, but that will not be granted; therefore this ſhould not bee pleaded for. Secondly, there be two kinds of teaching, one by office, as an Elder; the other without office and authority, as any private perſon, yea women, *Titus* 2. *Matthew* ſpeakes of the firſt onely, therefore it will not follow, becauſe Miniſters are put into an office to teach and baptize, therefore every one that may teach, may baptize.

To the third, *Philip* was not *Laicus*, therefore it will not prove that any no officer may baptize. Secondly, he was an Evangeliſt, *Acts* 21. it will not prove therefore that a Deacon may. Thirdly, he had an immediate calling, and therefore was extraordinary; *Ananias* alſo had the ſame, the conſequence failes therefore. Again, *Ananias* was the Paſtor of that Church at *Damaſcus*, who certainly were not here all this time without an officer. *Peter* commanded they ſhould bee baptized: but it followeth not that hee might not baptize them himſelfe. Again, who can ſay, there were no officers beſides him? When was *Paul* without an officer in company?

To the fourth, from convenience: the reaſon will prove it to be convenient at all times, as well as in caſe of neceſſity, and therefore why ſhould it be limited to any caſe? yea, and for any perſon, and as well in preſence of an officer, as abſent, and therefore ſhould not be limited.

Laſt of all, there is no more neceſſity of being baptized with water, then of eating the bread and drinking the wine: yet it is not allowed to be common, but appropriated to Miniſters, and yet the reaſon will as well prove commonneſſe of this as the other.

To the fifth, humane authority without Scripture is of no force to argue points of Chriſtianity.

That of *Athanaſius* done in ſport, is abſurd, and ſheweth the boldneſſe of ſuperſtition.

Concerning heretickes baptiſme, they had Miniſteriall calling, and therefore it is beſide the ſtate of the queſtion.

Secondly, ſome again ſtating the queſtion after Antichriſts exaltation, propound three wayes as profeſſed in the world:

The first, by such as hold a succession of Ministers from *Rome*, or Iesse, and so of Baptisme.

A second, of Familists, and the scattered flock, that none may meddle therewith lawfully, till there come some extraordinary men, and condemning both these.

A third, is holding forth and affirming, that any Disciple of Christ, in what part of the world soever, coming to the Lords way by the Word and Spirit of God, preaching that Word of God unto others, and converting them, he may, and ought also to baptize them.

To prove this, they bring three Arguments:

The first is taken from the re-building of the Temple, after the captivity in *Babylon*, by proportion, thus: As every *Israelite* then, with whom the Lord was, and whose spirit the Lord stirred up, was commanded to go to build, *Ezr.* 1. 3, 5. though some were more excellent in the businesse then the other; so now, every spirituall *Israelite*, with whom the Lord is, and whose spirit the Lord stirreth up, is commanded to go and build the spirituall Temple, which they do, by begetting men anew, by the immortall seed of the Word, so making them living stones; and then couple them together a spirituall house upon confession of their sins by baptisme.

In brief, an *Israelite* circumcised in flesh, God stirring up his heart, was commanded to build the Temple made with hands, from the first stone to the last. Therefore an *Israelite* circumcised in heart, (not baptized in the flesh) God stirring him up, is to build the Temple made without hands, from the first stone to the last: Go preach and baptize, teaching his Disciples to the end of the world.

The second Argument; If *John Baptist*, being unbaptized himself, preached, converted, and baptized, then may any man else do so too; but *John Baptist* unbaptized, preached, converted, and baptized; *Ergo*, any man unbaptized may preach, convert, and baptize. The consequence they prove thus: All things written afore time, were written for our instruction, *Rom.* 15. 4. The same God that spake with *John* in the Wildernesse, speaketh now to us in the Scriptures, the same word hee spake to *John*; and therefore, seeing the Lord hath spoken, who shall not preach and practise according to his Word; seeing God now speaketh to no particular person, one more then another?

The third is from humane authority: Mr. *Perkins*, and others confesse,

confeſſe, that if a *Turk* ſhould come to the knowledge of the truth in *Turkie*, he might preach the Word to others, and converting them, might baptize them, though unbaptized himſelf.

Now, theſe are their Arguments; to which I anſwer:

Firſt, in generall the apprehenſion falls in with the *Papiſts* determination in the point, and herein differ; that they hold it may be lawfull for any, yea, unbaptized, in caſe of neceſſity, and extraordinarily to baptize, when no other can be gotten; but theſe hold that any unbaptized may do it, in any caſe, at all times, and ordinarily; nor do their Arguments exclude women, whoſe ſpirits the Lord may ſtir up; and the inſtance, that the captives returning include them fully: for of that ſex, there were ſome forward in the work, *Neh.*3.12 as of old, in building the Tabernacle, *Exod.*35.22.

In particular I anſwer to the firſt Argument: Firſt, the conſequence is falſe; for the compariſon is not of things alike: The Temple ſignified Chriſts humane nature, and Heaven, and ſometimes it ſignifies a Believer, and not a church-eſtate, as is cleer, *Joh.*2. calling his body *the Temple*, *Heb.*8.2. Chap.9.1. Chap.11.24. *A Tabernacle* more excellent, *not made with hands*, nor of this building, which were figures of the other, and true Tabernacle and Temple which God had builded, and not man; to argue from the Temple to the Church (whereas it was a figure of Chriſt) cannot be allowed.

Secondly, the builders were all Gods viſible people in covenant with him, and circumciſed; but the argument ſpeaks of them that are not Gods viſible people, nor baptized, *&c.* therefore not to be admitted to build, as *Neh.* 2. 20. *Ezr.* 4.

Thirdly, they went up, the whole body together to build, but they did not all actually build, but ſome workmen only, whom God had made able and skilfull, the reſt of the people incouraged, contributed and overſaw the reſt, *Ezr.*3.7. to the 10. So by proportion, every one may not, every one cannot actually perform this thing, only the Carpenters and workmen whom God hath gifted, and juſtly officiated to that purpoſe; the reſt muſt incourage, contribute and forward the work, according to their place.

Fourthly, they had Gods Word by *Cyrus* to ſet them on; and being hindred, had *Haggai* and *Zachary* to preſſe them to it; but theſe look for no ſuch allowance. Beſides, it is incongruous to oppoſe the Temple made with hands, to the Church as made without

hands, and alſo that the church is wholly made without hands, being made by mens endevours; yea, effecting ſometimes no true infallible ſpirituall ſtones.

Laſt of all, it diſſolveth and overturneth that inſtitution of Chriſt, *Epheſ.* 4. 11. *Who gave ſome to be Apoſtles, &c. for the gathering and perfecting of the Saints*; whereas they ſay every man may doe it, and apply at randome that to every man, no officer nor baptized perſon.

That of *Mat.* 28. was ſpoken but to the eleven who were baptized and eſpeciall officers already choſen and ſet up officers in the church.

To the ſecond from *John Baptiſt, &c.* the Antecedent affirms *John* unbaptized; but no word of proof given, nor one ſyllable of reaſon: For though it bee not expreſſed of whom, when, and where he was baptized (nor is there mention of Chriſts Apoſtles baptiſme,) yet it follows not that *John* was not baptized. If I ſhall affirme the contrary, *viz.* that *John* was baptized, and inferre from hence, no perſon unbaptized may baptize; for *John* was baptized, and ſay it is written for our inſtruction: this will not be granted. And why might not *John* baptize himſelfe, being the beginner of the new Teſtament, as *Abraham* circumciſed himſelfe, though after ſome body circumciſed did it? And if *John Hel,* (or *Smith*) baptized himſelf firſt, and then baptized others, *John Baptiſt* might doe it as well as he. Or what if God baptized him, as he buried *Moſes*? Or what if he were baptized in the Jewiſh church, they practiſing a baptiſme to every proſelyte, to make them members incorporate into the common-wealth of Iſrael?

But ſecondly, I deny the conſequence. For ſuppoſe *John* unbaptized, yet it followeth not, what *John* did, every man may doe, becauſe there is a vaſt difference between the beginning of things, and in conſtituting, and a thing now conſtituted. And the proofe of the conſequence is invalid and unſound: For if whatſoever be written, be written for our learning, and the ſame word ſpoken to them in the Scripture formerly, is now ſpoken to us in the ſame conſideration, then let every man goe ſacrifice his ſonne, as *Abraham* did, rob the Indians as the Iſraelites did the Egyptians, kill an unbeleever ſtriving with a Chriſtian, as *Moſes* did, goe to *Rome* as *Paul* did, and a thouſand the like: for it is written for our inſtruction, and the ſame word ſpoken to them, is now ſpoken to us in the Scripture:

ture: who ſeeth not groſſe abſurdity here? Again, if all may and muſt doe as *John*, how is it that *John* did it alone, and none elſe but hee? Not a man before or after him, baptized, or unbaptized, except they had an eſpeciall calling thereto, as Chriſts Apoſtles. And *John* himſelfe took it not upon himſelfe, but was ſent, and commanded ſo to doe, *John* 1. 33. Not by a motion of his own ſpirit or willingneſſe, but by an immediate revelation, and divine appointment: ſo that the conſequence from *John*, having ſuch a calling, ſo evident and heavenly, as the Phariſees durſt not oppoſe, to any man, upon a willingneſſe of mind, and inward motion (not heroicall and of divine inſpiration, but) private and common to all, is as bad as from a lawfull Magiſtrate to an Uſurper.

To the third Argument from Mr. *Perkins*, and others (which are not named) I anſwer in a word: Firſt, it is unjuſt to uſe humane authority to preſſe others, yet to reject it our ſelves: Mr. *Perkins* ſaith, Infants muſt bee baptized. Secondly, humane authority, though the men be never ſo many, never ſo eminent, is no foundation of divine diſputations. The Argument from humane authority is as eaſily rejected as propounded, though otherwiſe much good uſe may be made of their writings, and by the ableſt gifted.

But thirdly, what other men ſay (except I read them, or ſome relate them) or what Mr. *Perkins* ſaith in other places, I know not; (for no place is quoted) but what I read in him upon *Galat.* 1. 11. *pag.* 172. is nothing to this purpoſe: and what hee ſaith, is quite contrary. His words are theſe: *If in Turkie, America, or elſe where, the Goſpel ſhould be received of men by counſell and perſwaſion of private perſons, they ſhall not need to ſend into Europe for conſecrated Miniſters; for they have power to chuſe their Miniſters within themſelves: For where the Lord gives the Word, he gives the power alſo.* Where hee ſpeakes not a word of a perſon unbaptized, converting and baptizing others. But firſt, if they ſhould be converted by endevours of privat perſons, and not ſtirred up in their owne minds to convert others. Secondly, he ſaith not, theſe private perſons are unbaptized, but implieth and intendeth they are baptized; as I have read the caſe thus ſtated: If ſome private Chriſtians caſt there by Shipwrack, and ſhould do ſuch a thing, the caſe now ſtands thus: Who ſhall be a Miniſter to theſe new converts by theſe private men converted, that may adminiſter to them in office, the things of God? (w^ch^ he holds out as neceſſary) and there being but two wayes, either to ſend

where

have no right at all to this ordinance; yea, though the parents consent, much lesse against their consent: Notwithstanding others undertaking for them; I except only two cases:

1. Slaves and servants bought with money, these being Infants, may be baptized, for ought I know.

2. When Infidell parents are converted, and desire church-fellowship, and thereby themselves and Infants are to be baptized, I conclude in these two cases; that Infants born of Infidell parents may be baptized; and therefore I judge that Infidell Infants are in no wise to be baptized, because they are unclean, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. therefore such are to be deferred, till they be converted, and give testimony of their own faith and repentance.

Two Questions may be here resolved:

1. In case of excommunicate persons; Whether an Infant born of parents, both under the censure of the church, and the state of excommunication, may be baptized, if any will undertake for them:

I answer, No.

First, because they are in that estate, as Heathens, and neither of them in visible covenant.

Secondly, if by others undertaking, why not Infants of *Indians* also?

Thirdly, if by faith of fore-fathers, as I see no Scriptures for it, so, where will you limit it? Suppose a converted childe of *Esau* in *Davids* time could prove successively, and to all evidently, that hee came of *Esau* the son of *Isaac*; whether should it have been circumcised as a Proselyte, or as *Isaac's* seed?

A second Question, is concerning Infants baptized of Heretikes, whether lawfull?

I answer: If the person baptizing had a true calling, though stained with some corruption in the person or calling; and in the administration of baptisme, nothing essentiall omitted in matter, or form, those persons are not to be baptized again; because baptisme is not to be administred twice to any: But if any of the essentials were omitted, such persons are to be baptized, as not baptized before. And now I come to the other particular; that Infants of Believers, and visible professors, are to be baptized; yea, though but one of the parents be in church-fellowship, which I shall prove after I have premised a few things.

1. The Scriptures containing the books of the new and old Testament,

Teſtament, are full of perfection, containing a moſt perfect rule of all things concerning faith, and order: So that in theſe reſpects, nothing is to be urged as neceſſary, nor allowed as lawfull, but what is juſtly comprehended in them.

2. There are two wayes whereby we may finde what Gods will is in all caſes, concerning the premiſes; either in expreſſe terms, or by juſt conſequence drawn from thence. So that whatſoever is not literally expreſſed, or drawn from the letter by neceſſary conſequence, is to be rejected, as not the Lords minde.

3. Whatſoever can be collected by true deduction from any part of Scripture expounded in the largeſt ſenſe, is as truly contained in them, as that which is ſet down in expreſſe terms, and ſo is of the ſame force with that which is expreſſed: So our Saviour urgeth the Devill, *Matth.* 4. with that word (only) from *Deut.* which yet is not in the Text, but truly drawn from thence. So the Proteſtant urging juſtification by faith only, oppoſe the Papiſts, yet (only) is not expreſſed, but neceſſarily drawn from thence: For if there be bnt two wayes of juſtification, (as there is not) and we be not juſtified by works, as the Text ſaith, then by faith only: And *Exod.* 21. 28, *&c.* under the caſe of an Ox in all thoſe particulars cleerly by conſequence any other creature that may do hurt, in the like caſe is intended, as Cowe, Dog, Goat, *&c.*

4. The tender of immortality, and happineſſe of God to mankind, hath been two wayes diſpenſed:

Firſt, to *Adam*, and all mankind in his loynes by the Law, upon condition of perfect obedience thereto in mans own perſonall righteouſneſſe.

Secondly, *Adam* tranſgreſſing, loſt immortality and happineſſe in himſelf and all man-kind, and involved them and himſelf in ſin, and eternall wrath thereby, God the Father, for the praiſe of his grace, having predeſtinated ſome to that adoption of ſon-ſhip in his Son, and given them to his Son to be ſaved by him, (that hee might be glorified with the Father) and hee receiving them at his Fathers hands, becauſe they were partakers of fleſh and blood, hee himſelf alſo took fleſh and blood upon him, and in that humane nature fulfilled the Law for them actually, and ſo reconciled them all to the Father in himſelf, that ſo God might be juſt, and the juſtifier of the ungodly, that ſhould believe in Jeſus.

From hence the Father maketh a new tender of life, ſetting forth

his Son to be a propitiation through his blood, offering him and his righteousneſſe, (in his humane nature, and performed by it in obedience, active, paſſive, to his holy will) to all which ſhall believe, and by that faith be found in him, having his righeousneſſe upon them; accounting them thereby righteous, and no ſinners, and making them from thence, through the life of his Son manifeſted in them by ſanctification of that holy Spirit partakers of life and immortality again. This tender being one and the ſame in ſubſtance for ever, from the firſt promulgation to *Adam* and *Eve* in Paradiſe, till this day, and to the end, yet hath it admitted of variation in the circumſtances thereof; as is cleere from four ſeverall and remarkable periods.

1. From *Adam* fallen to *Abraham*, under a promiſe of the ſeed of the woman to break the Serpents head, *Gen.* 3. 15.

2. The ſecond, from *Abraham* to *Moſes* time in the wilderneſſe, in ſubſtance the ſame with the former, yet differing from it:

Firſt, in promiſing the ſeed of the woman to proceed from *Abrahams* loynes according to the fleſh ſucceſſively.

Secondly, by paſſing the promiſe into a ſolemne formall viſible covenant, as the father of the bleſſed, and all-bleſſing ſeed, and of all believers of all nations.

Thirdly, confirming it by circumciſion, the ſign and ſeal of the righteouſneſſe of faith, which he had yet being uncircumciſed.

3. The third from *Moſes* to Chriſts coming in the fleſh; this is the ſame in ſubſtance with the former, the ſame Chriſt, and doctrine, and grace diſpenſed, but differing from the former in the manner of diſpenſation, in divers circumſtances:

Firſt, in adding theſe ten words in tables of ſtone, and drawing a vail of ſhadowes over it, conſiſting of all thoſe Lawes and Ordinances delivered to *Moſes* on the mount, according to the pattern ſhewed him, and by him communicated to the people.

Secondly, in adding the Ordinance of the Paſſeover, with divers rites thereto belonging; all which were to continue till the time of Reformation; and this, and not the former, is the old Teſtament, ratified by the death of Bulls and Goats, &c. Shadows of better things, without the application whereof, the other purified the fleſh, and not the conſcience.

4. The fourth begins with the manifeſtation of the Son of God in the fleſh, and ſtill continues, and is the new Teſtament, ratified

by the death and blood of the Lord Jeſus, the teſtator, who being come, the vaile of ſhadowes was utterly removed, and the *Moſaicall* adminiſtrations quite aboliſhed; the old being done away, that the new might be eſtabliſhed, which cannot be removed. And this is to be attended, that all the Scriptures that ſpeak of the removall of the old, and ſetting up of the new Teſtament; or that declare the aboliſhing of the old, and eſtabliſhing of the new, (as was foretold) is to be underſtood of theſe two periods, from *Moſes* to Chriſt, and after; not of that from *Abraham* to *Moſes*; and he oppoſition in this caſe made in the Scriptures, is of that under *Moſes* and Chriſt only.

5. The covenant that God made with *Abraham*, and continued to his ſeed, the *Jewes*, and us *Gentiles*, hath two parts in it; the firſt reſpecteth God, the other reſpecteth us: In the firſt, concerning God, is contained all that concerns our good, temporall and eternall, and himſelf held forth, as the ſole efficient of all; preventing us with his grace freely, and performing all the good pleaſure of his grace in us, according to his own will; nor doth any thing, that hee is pleaſed to work, depend on us, nor requires he any thing of us by way of efficiencie or cauſality; yet ſo, as that hee worketh ſomething in us without us; even being meerly paſſive in the act of working, till it be firſt wrought; ſomething he works by us, ſtirring up and aſſiſting that which hee hath firſt wrought in us; nor can we at firſt do any thing, till hee hath principled us by ſupernaturall grace; nor firſt, or laſt, more then hee helpeth us, who worketh all, the will and deed according to his will.

6. Infants are paſſively capable of the diſpenſation of God, and of the Spirit and grace of the covenant, and what ever men of yeers are capable of, though not wrought in the ſame way, or by the ſame means, yet the ſame things, and by the ſame Spirit, ſo far as is neceſſary to union with Chriſt, and his juſtification to life thereby, elſe no children dying Infants, are elected, or ſhall be raiſed up again in their bodies, and ſaved; nor is the judgement that we can have of men of yeers infallible, as in *Simon Magus*, &c.

7. The Lord having taken hold of any man or woman, by outward diſpenſation of means, to call them out of Infidelity, into viſible profeſſion of faith in the Word of his grace and obedience to his commands, they are hereby made partakers of his covenant, and all the priviledges outwardly belonging thereto; yea, though

they have not saving faith, but be hypocrites; and so themselves, and all that ever proceed from them, continue in the same state, parents and children successively, so long as the Lord continues the course of his dispensation; nor can any alteration befall them, whereby this estate is dissolved, but some apparent act of God breaking them off from him.

8. Baptisme is not the first grace, but the second; nor doth it confer grace, but confirm the former, which therefore must be presupposed; and it is the seal of the righteousnesse of faith in the new Testament, to all that receive it, as circumcision of old was to them, *Rom.*4. 11. By baptisme I mean the ordinance of the church administred by a just calling, which is too oft, (though it never should be) separated from inward grace, yet remains true baptisme so administred, else *Simon Magus*, and those false brethren, *Gal.*2. being not inwardly baptized, were not truly baptized, and if they had repented, must be baptized anew.

9. Last of all: as of old more was required of *Abraham*, and of men of yeers, turning Proselytes, when they were to be circumcised, then of *Isaac* and their Infants, continually afterwards circumcised: So now, in administring baptisme to persons, more is required of men of yeers, then of Infants. God required faith of *Abraham* in the blessing seed, before circumcised; but hee required not faith of *Isaac*, nor of any one of *Abrahams* seed after him, before circumcision; but that they should believe afterward, which he promised to work in them. So now, of men of yeers, faith is to be required, and must be, that a man of yeers be baptized, but not so of Infants of baptized persons, who are to be baptized, that they may believe afterward, &c.

Having premised thus much; I come to the proof of the question, that Infants of believing parents, and in covenant with God, by visible profession, may and ought to be baptized.

ARGUMENTS.

¶ 1. IF the covenant now under Christ be the same that it was with *Abraham* and the Jewes before Christ; then, as Infants were in that covenant, and partakers of the signe thereof, circumcision; so are Infants now in the covenant, and should receive the signe thereof, baptisme: But the covenant now under Christ, is the same with

with that before Christ, with *Abraham* and his posterity in the flesh: Therefore as Infants were then in the covenant, and signed with circumcision, so are Infants now in the covenant, and are to receive baptisme the signe thereof.

In this Argument three things are to be cleared: First, that the covenant made with *Abraham* and his posterity before Christ, and this under Christ, is the same.

And secondly, that Infants were then in that covenant, so they be now in this.

And thirdly, that all Jewish Infants were then partakers of the signe, and circumcised; and so should Infants now receive baptisme, the signe of it. Of each of these I will set down particular grounds.

1. That the covenant with *Abraham* and the Jewes before, and the Gentiles now, is the same, is evident by these reasons:

First, the Gospel is the doctrine of the covenant, but this is but one, *Gal.* 1.6. and was preached to *Abraham*, *Gal.* 3.8. *Rom.* 4.11. and to the Jewes in the wildernesse, *Heb.* 3. & 4. and in *Davids* time, *Heb.* 4.7. from *Psal.* 95. and during their whole state, *Rom.* 9.31. & 10.2. This Gospel is now preached to us, *Heb.* 4.2. Therefore the covenant is the same in all, and it is an injurious thing to Gods grace, and utterly against the Scriptures to affirm, that that covenant was of nature in the flesh, and of earthly things: This is of grace, in the spirit, and of heavenly things. And as little understanding doe they shew in Gods word, that say Gods covenant was in their flesh; because circumcision outward was in their flesh. For though God calls it his covenant, yet it is not, but the signe of it, as he after expresseth, and outward baptisme is no lesse on the flesh, then it, and so may be called Gods covenant on the flesh.

Secondly, if *Abraham* be the Father of the Jewes and Gentiles equally, as he beleeves the righteousnesse of faith, and they his children equally, as so beleeving, and no otherwise, then the covenant is the same: But *Abraham* is the father of Jewes and Gentiles equally, as he beleeves, and they his children equally, as so beleeving, *Rom.* 4.11, 12, 16, 17, 23, 24. *Gal.* 3. 7, 9, 26. 29. Therefore the covenant is the same. By [beleeving] I mean the profession of Faith.

Thirdly, the standing of the Jewes under the grace of God, was the same with *Abraham*, as is cleare from Gods often expressing himselfe to be the God of their Fathers, *Abraham*, &c. and dispensing himselfe according to the covenant made with *Abraham*, &c.

and

and to his posterity, *Exod.* 2. 24. 2 *Reg.* 13. 23. And their praying to the Lord to remember his covenant made with *Abraham*, &c. acknowledging the accomplishment of it to them, *Luke* 2. 54. and 72. 74. And let not any say, it was a covenant of giving the Land of *Canaan*: For if that were all, why did *David*, so long after *Joshuah*, possesse them of *Canaan*, when they had rest there, yet still provoke them in his time, to enter into Gods rest, lest they should be shut out as their Fathers were in the wildernesse, as the Apostle argueth, *Heb.* 3. 4. was this the land of *Canaan* (unlesse as a type?) was it not Christ, and Gods free grace? Now our standing is the same with the Jewes, as is evident, *Matth.* 21. 4. *chap.* 22. 1.

2. That the Infants of the Jewes were then in the covenant, will not be denied. That Infants are now in the covenant, whose parents professe the faith, I prove thus: (1.) Else the covenant was not the same with the former, but another: But it is the same with the former, and not another diverse from that, as I have proved. *Ergo, &c.* Else the state of the grace of God should bee straitned, and made of lesse extent by Christs comming, then it was before; whereas it is more enlarged, and of greater extent.

3. If Infants be not now in the covenant, as well as then, either it is because God hath excluded them expressly, or there was something more in the persons of beleevers then, then now, to interest Infants in it: But God hath no where expressly excluded them, nor was there any thing in the persons then, more then now, to interest them. Therefore Infants are now in the covenant, as then.

4. If Jewes and Gentiles bee incorporated into one body in Christ, and the Jewes Infants were in the body before, and so continued; then so must the infants of Christian Gentiles be now. But the Gentiles and Jewes be incorporate into one body in Christ, (by the Gentiles being made neere, and Citizens, which they were not before, as the Jewes were, but strangers and farre off) *Ephes.* 2. 11, 13, 20. & 3. 6. and the Jewes Infants were, and continued in that body, therefore so are the Infants of beleeving Gentiles.

3. Infants should now be baptized, as then they were circumcised. To cleare it further, I adde these considerations.

1. Else the covenant was not the same then and now, nor Infants in it now as then, which I have proved to be otherwise.

2. If they have the thing and substance, they cannot be denyed the signe and circumstance; if the first grace, then the second and con-

confirming : But Infants have the thing and ſubſtance, for they have the ſame covenant, and the Kingdome of heaven which was taken from the Jewes, of which Infants were ſubjects, as well as elder men, is now given to the Gentiles. Therefore, as *Peter*, *Acts* 10. ſo ſay I, Who can forbid water, that Infants ſhould not be baptized as well as men of years, ſeeing they are ſubjects of the Kingdome as well as they?

3. Elſe there ſhould be no difference between the Infants of Gentiles beleeving, & Pagans and Infidels, as there was before between the Jews Infants, and the Gentiles, which as it is uncomfortable, & without juſt ground, to ſay ſo, ſo it is contrary to the word of God, which affirmeth, that the Infants of beleeving Gentiles are holy, and not as the Infants of Infidels, which are profane. This is manifeſt, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. where the Apoſtle reſolving this ſcruple, Whether a beleever might continue to cohabite and enjoy marriage-fellowſhip with an Infidell yoke-fellow, and not be polluted; and he affirming it, cleareth his affirmation by three Arguments :

1. Firſt, from the priviledge of the ſtate of grace to a beleever himſelfe, that being by faith pure himſelfe, all things are pure to him, and ſo the ſociety of marriage with an Infidell. And this to be ſo, hee cleareth, viz. That an Infidell is ſanctified to a beleeving yoke-mate.

2. From a priviledge of the ſtate of grace to their children, that they themſelves being pure by faith, their children are thereby born pure of them, and holy in that eſtate; which could not be, if the ſociety of marriage was polluted. This is the true meaning of the words; yet what holineſſe is here meant, hath troubled men, who have travelled with variety in expounding or torturing theſe few words: Some will have them underſtood politically, and that two wayes: 1. In reſpect of the preſent children born of them, which could not be legitimate, if their marriage was not lawfull. 2. In reſpect of thoſe children they might have by others, if they ſhould forſake this marriage, and betake them to another, thoſe children would be baſtards.

Some ceremonially, of uncleanneſſe of children begotten in time of the womans diſeaſe, and are holy, when the Infidell partie forbears that time; which is abſurd and groundleſſe.

Some take it religiouſly: But here they differ, ſome will have it to mean future holineſſe, which the Parent by cohabitation may

make

make the child partaker of: either obtaining it may bee baptized, or by counsell when they come to age.

But if they forsake the Infidell party, then the children will remain in infidelity still.

Others take it for present holinesse, yet not in one sense: for some conceive thus: That the beleever abiding and gaining the Infidell party, the children shall be holy, that is, both parents that dedicate and devote them to God.

Others take it of foederall holinesse, and is nothing else but that the children doe belong to the covenant of God, as well as the parent, and as well as if both parents had been beleevers. Thus diversly are the words taken. To issue all, note these things:

First, that it pertains to children of one at least beleeving, which is evident, because he speaks to a case not of all mankind, but of an Infidell with a beleever: Therefore the argument must bee taken from some thing proper to a beleever: so it is in the first Argument. Though all things naturall, in regard of the use of them, be common to Infidels with beleevers, (as to eate, sleep, &c.) yet the impurity of conscience defileth the use of every thing to an Infidell; and the purity of conscience purifieth the use of every thing to a beleever, 1 *Tim.*4.4. And as this is taken from something proper to a beleever, so in this of childrens holinesse: Therefore legitimation cannot be meant, because that is no more proper to a beleever then an Infidell. *Pilat* was as legitimate as *Paul*, though not so holy. Never was it heard that Infidels children were called holy, nor can an instance bee given of this notion, viz. that an holy childe should signifie legitimate. Again, to make marriage lawfull, it is not necessary that the parties, at least one of them, bee a beleever, (else there were no lawfull marriage among Infidels.)

The question is not therefore of legitimate marriage, but of legitimate marriage polluted. It were to no purpose to argue from legitimacie of children to prove that: for children are alwayes legitimate from lawfull marriage, whether the marriage bee uncleane and impure, or not. Therefore it cannot bee meant of legitimacie.

Secondly, it is spoken of something present, notwithstanding the disparity of religion continue. This is manifest, because the beleever must not depart from the Infidell willing to cohabite, because the children are holy.

Now, if he ſhould mean when the Infidell party is converted, or the children afterward, this being uncertain, whether ever it ſhould be or no; the queſtion is left unreſolved, the ſcruple is not removed, and it is uncertain from thence, whether ever it ſhall be a pure marriage or no, and in the mean time is not: The expoſition therefore of holineſſe of children in reſpect of future, and what may be, is not ſound. I take it therefore of fœderall holineſſe, whereby the children are with their believing parents taken by God to be his, and by him put under his covenant, and ſo they continue when men of yeers, though they never have any further grace wrought in them; nor have any other ſtate upon them, then what they had when they were born: nor are they right that do expound it, to be all one with the former, of the Infidels ſanctified to the believing partie, as if he ſhould ſay, you need not queſtion your dwelling with the Infidell party, no more then you queſtion your dwelling with your children: For,

Firſt, there is a two-fold holineſſe, the Apoſtle ſpeaks of the one, not of the thing it ſelf, but to the believers uſe; the other of the thing it ſelf, and not in regard of the believers uſe, and it is unjuſt to confound them.

Secondly, the dwelling with the Infidell party was not ſcrupled, but the enjoyment of marriage ſociety, and therefore children are not to be compared with them in that reſpect.

Laſt of all, the words are brought to prove that a believing party ſanctifieth the Infidell party, and therefore that cannot be the ſenſe of it, and it were to prove the ſame by the ſame, *&c.*

¶ 2. If in the promiſe made to *Abraham*, *I will be the God of thee and of thy ſeed*, both *Jewes* and *Gentiles* are included, and of old, Infants as well as men of yeeres, and therefore circumciſed, then Infants now alſo, and ſo to be baptized; but under that promiſe, both *Jewes* and *Gentiles* are included, and their Infants, and for that cauſe circumciſed; *Ergo*, ſo are Infants now, and for that cauſe to be baptized.

Firſt, the promiſe was made to *Abraham*, and to his ſeed, which are both *Jewes* and *Gentiles*, and therefore made unto him in the ſtate of uncircumciſion, and after that circumciſed, *Rom.* 4. 11. to 16. *Gal.* 3. 8.

Secondly, Infants were then under that promiſe, and for that cauſe circumciſed, becauſe God was their God, as well as of men

of yeers; yea, from thence he was their God, when men of yeers; Nor did God actually first require faith of any *Jewes* (after *Abrahams* time) to become their God; but God freely vouchsafed them that grace from an act of their own; nor did the unbeliefe of men of yeers frustrate that grace of God, but still he made it good, and continued it unto them in all their apostasies, untill by some manifest act he cast them off, as he did at last the ten Tribes; and finally, all in the dayes of his Sons manifestation; nor might any Infant but a *Jewes* be circumcised, except himself first was incorporated into the *Jewish* body Ecclesiasticall.

Thirdly, that Infants now also are under that promise, and so to be baptized as a part of that seed; they were in it till Christs time, and why should they be now excluded? or let any shew who did it, or where it was done, it shall be sufficient. If any shall say, that believers are the seed of *Abraham*. I answer, so it was among the *Jewes*, *Rom.* 9. 6, 7, 8. the children of promise are counted for the seed; and therefore our Saviour argueth them not to be the children of *Abraham*, but of their father the Devill, *Joh.* 8. Let this then be noted that our Saviour and his Apostle speaketh thus of them in a certain respect; and we are to consider them: first, as *Abrahams* seed federally, continuing in outward profession, and so they were all Gods people, men and Infants, and were all under that promise, and so were partakers of all promises and priviledges given unto that people on Gods part offered, *Rom.* 9. 4, 5.

Secondly, as under Gods election of grace, and so the elect only obtained the things promised, whether Infants, or men of yeers, *Rom.* 11. But the want of obtaining did not make them not to be the seed, nor under that promise in another sense: *Abraham* had two sons, the one obtained, the other not, of his posterity there were alwayes of them two sorts, the one bound after the flesh (not naturally, but in another sense,) the other after the Spirit, and so it is now, *Gal.* 4. But being after the flesh, did not make that God was not their God, and they *Abrahams* seed fœderally: So then it remains, that as the *Jewes* Infants were included under that promise, and for that cause circumcised; so the *Gentiles* believing are with their Infants under that promise, and for that cause to be baptized, though only the elect, whether Infants, or men of yeers, *Jewes* or *Gentiles*, do obtain. the rest are hardened, and take we heed that we increase not the number of them.

If in the whole body of *Israel*, as well Infants as men of yeeres, were baptized, and with the ſame ſpirituall baptiſme that ours is; then Infants are nowto be baptized: But in the whole body of *Iſrael* Infants were baptized with the ſame ſpirituall baptiſme that ours is; *Ergo*, Infants are now to be baptized; I mean, Infants of believing parents, and not any other. ¶ 3.

1. Firſt, that it was the ſame ſpirituall baptiſme with ours, is evident, 1 *Cor.* 10. 1, &c.

1. The other ordinances there mentioned, were the ſame ſpiritually with ours; they eat the ſame ſpirituall meat, and drank the ſame ſpirituall drink, on Gods part diſpenſing, and whoſoever eat and drank unworthily, not diſcerning the Lords body and blood, were guilty on their part of his body and blood, therefore they were baptized with the ſame ſpirituall baptiſme with ours.

2. Otherwiſe the Apoſtle ſhould link things together in his argument that were not equall, nor would it be of force with the *Corinthians*, if they were not the ſame with ours ſpiritually; nor the concluſion certain, that they ſhould be puniſhed with the like puniſhment, if they committed the like ſins.

2. Secondly, it cannot be denied, but thoſe Infants were baptized with the ſame ſpirituall baptiſme, though they could not actually repent and believe, for they were a part of all *Iſrael*; nor had all men of yeers faith and repentance; God baptized them all, one as well as another, though all obtained not the full benefit of it, but only the elect. If then Infants were baptized with the ſame ſpirituall baptiſme, ſignified and diſpenſed by thoſe ſignes, no reaſon can be given, why Infants may not now be baptized with the ſame ſpirituall baptiſme diſpenſed by other ſignes; and here wee have an example of Infants baptiſme, which ſome call for ſo much.

There is the ſame reaſon of the firſt fruits and the lump; of the root and branches; but the firſt fruits and root believing parents are holy, and muſt be baptized; *Ergo*, Infants the lump and branches are holy, and muſt be baptized. ¶ 4.

1. The firſt is cleer from the Law of ſanctifying the lump, by offering the firſt fruits, there is nothing more required, and ſo *Rom.* 11. 16.

2. The ſecond is cleer alſo, from *Rom.* 11. 16. where note:

1. *Abraham* and the Father are the firſt fruits and root, and ſo all

believing parents, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14, &c. Infants having no actuall unbeliefe, could not be cut off with their parents.

2. That Infants of believing parents are branches of that root, and men of yeers no otherwise branches then as they were branches first, when Infants.

3. The branches then broken off, are those men of yeers, and Infants then rejected, with all their posterity to this day.

4. That all the *Jewes* were not rejected, but some branches continued on, and they men of yeeres, with their Infants, and were baptized, that all those *Jewes* not broken off had no Infants is unlikely, without question they had many; that they were branches before their parents closing with the way of the new Testament, cannot be denyed; that they were broken off for actuall unbeliefe, could not be; that their parents continued on branches, and the Infants broken off, will never be proved; but it is manifest that they continued branches of their parents, or of the fathers with their parents, and so were baptized, else their parents condition should be worse under the state of grace administred in the new Testament, then it was in the old, and they should change from the better to the worse; their children who before were branches of the root, and now should be broken off, their parents continuing still, and should be in no better case then Infidels Infants; and God who was their God before, now, should not be their God: and before they were circumcised, and that being abolished, they are left destitute of all signes of Gods grace, and may not be baptized; O wofull change, if so, or rather a sinfull charge upon Gods grace.

5. When *Jewes* shall be ingraffed again, as Infants with men of yeeres were broken off, so Infants shall be again implanted with their converted parents, else such branches should not be ingraffed as were broken off, which is quite contrary to the Text, and their case should be far worse then it was, which to hold, is to lay a stumbling block in the way of the *Jewes*, to hinder them from closing with Christ.

6. The *Gentiles* being implanted in stead of the *Jewes* broken off, as they were Infants, as well as men of yeers, so Infants of *Gentiles* believing, are ingraffed with their parents, else such branches are not ingraffed as were broken off: As then *Jewes* Infants, while branches, were by vertue thereof circumcised, and such as continued, when others were broken off were baptized: So also must

Infants

Infants of *Gentiles* be baptized, which is in part to be made partakers of the fatneſſe of the Olive, *Rom.* 11.16, 17.

¶ 5. If baptiſme ſucceeds circumciſion, then as Infants were circumciſed, ſo now they muſt be baptized; but baptiſme ſucceeds circumciſion; *Ergo.*

1. That baptiſme ſucceeds circumciſion, is cleere, *Col.*2.11,12. where the Apoſtle ſpeaks of two circumciſions, the one outward in the fleſh, made with hands, the other inward in the heart, made without hands. And though they had not the outward, which of old was the ſign and means of the inward; yet they needed it not, becauſe in Chriſt they were compleat, and through him made partakers of the inward, conveyed unto them by baptiſme, as the ſigne and ſeal thereof.

Again, either baptiſme ſucceeds circumciſion, or ſomething elſe ſucceeds it, or it hath nothing to ſucceed it. But it hath ſomething to ſucceed it, (as all other ordinances of the old Teſtament) and nothing elſe can be ſhewne; *Ergo*, baptiſme ſucceeds it.

Finally, the thing ſignified in both, is the ſame without alteration, which is cleanſing from ſin, by juſtification and ſanctification; *Ergo*, the ſigne in the former being removed, baptiſme muſt needs ſucceed it in place, as the ſign of the ſame thing.

2. Infants are therefore to be baptized, as they were circumciſed, there being nothing more required now, nor any thing that may hinder that Infants ſhould be baptized, then was required then, or that might hinder that they ſhould be then circumciſed. If then their outward circumciſion, the ſigne of the ſame ſpirituall circumciſion with ours, was applied to Infants then: So outward baptiſme the ſigne of the ſame ſpirituall circumciſion with theirs, may be applied to Infants now; nor do I know of any objection that need trouble any judiciouſly godly: For the two principall, that we have no command for baptizing them now, or any to be baptized, but Diſciples, are fully taken away in this Diſcourſe by the truth of it. And though I account not of humane teſtimony without Scriptures, of any authority to ſatisfie in divine matters, yet added to the former, it is not to be ſleighted. I ſhall therefore propound to conſideration, what I have obſerved, intending not to ſay all, nor to quote their ſayings at large, but to give ſome references only, and in this order:

Firſt, I will ſet down the judgement of ſingle learned men in their writings. Secondly,

Secondly, the consent of whole assemblies: And,

Thirdly, the practice of all churches in all ages.

First, that Infants have been, and ought to be baptized, receives confirmation from testimony of all ancient Writers, which I have been able to take notice of, as appeares by these places: *Justin Mart. in quæstion. Orthodox. Tertul. lib. de baptismo, cap.* 18. *pag.* 225. See *Junius* notes also upon it, *pag.* 157. *Dionysius, Areop.* quoted by *Thom.* 3. *qu.* 68. *art.* 9. *Origen* affirming that the church had it from the Apostles, *hom.* 2. in *Ps.* 38, & in *Levit. hom.* 8. & in 6. *ad Rom. Cyprian. Epist. lib.* 3. 8. *Epist. ad Fidum: Item. Epist.* in the first Tome of Councels, *pag.* 240. *Cyril.* upon *Lev.* 8. *Syricius epist.* in first tome of Councels, *Capit.* 1. *pag.* 493. *Hieron. lib.* 4. *in Ezek.* 16. *Idem lib.* 3. *contra Pelag. Idem Epist. ad Lætam. Aug. in Enchirid. cap.* 42. 43. 51. 65. *In lib. de definit. Orthodox. fidei, cap.* 21. *de fide ad Petrum cap.* 24. 27. 38. *Idem. lib.* 4. *de baptismo contra Donatist. cap.* 14. and in many other places, and against *Donatists, lib.* 4. *cap.* 23. hee hath these words: The baptisme of Infants was not derived from the authority of men, nor of Councels, but from the tradition and doctrine of the Apostles. *Greg. Nazian. de sacro Lavacro orat.* 3. *Ambros. de Abraha. lib.* 2. *cap.* 11. *Jeron. Critobul. contra Pelag. lib.* 3. &c.

Secondly, the attestation of whole assemblies declare as much, not ordaining, but bearing witnesse unto it upon speciall occasions, as the day and time of the yeer, &c. when they should be baptized, *Apostol. constitut. lib.* 6. *cap.* 15. *sub finem. pag.* 92. *Concil. Melevitan. cap.* 2. *p.* 555. *Concil. African. cap.* 77. *pag.* 584. *Epist. concilii Carthag. contra Cœlest. & Pelag. p.* 542. *Concil. Carthag. quint. cap.* 6. *pag.* 520.

Thirdly, the practice of all churches consent hereto. In the *African* churches they used to baptize Infants, as *Athanasius* testifieth, *Quæst.* 124. The same was used in the *Asian* churches, as *Nazianzen* affirmeth: And the *Magdeburgens.* in their Centuries observe, that in the first hundred yeeres after Christ, Infants were baptized; nor was it taken notice of in that age, that Infants were excluded from baptisme: and so continued in all ages to this day; and though the Eastern and Western churches separated, and did hold severall opinions and rites differing one from another, yet neither omitted the baptizing of Infants: Among the Eastern and African Christians, whereof there are some whole kingdomes, and very many in severall kingdomes scattered here and there in companies, and divided amongst themselves into eleven observable factions

and

and fractions, yet have they all ſucceſſively holden & do hold baptizing Infants: with ſome difference, I confeſſe; ſome not baptizing males afore forty dayes, nor females before eightie, though they die before: ſome not before, except in caſe of neceſſity: ſome ſooner, but none later, that I have obſerved. In like manner, the Weſterne churches have had, and have ſome difference in ſome rites and ceremonies, yet not at all in the point of baptizing Infants: And as in the Eaſtern churches before and after ſeparation from the reſt, and never yeelding ſubjection to the Pope of *Rome*: So in the Weſtern it is evident, that it was every where, and alwayes practiſed before the exaltation of that *Antichriſt*; upon which conſiderations I count it a defect of modeſty and charity, to call this practice *Antichriſtian* and humane invention, and to wave ſuch light of all ages, in ſo weighty and plain a caſe, agreeable to the evidence of former arguments.

For cloze of the Arguments, I ſhal ſay this more: The firſt that denied the baptiſm of Infants, and oppoſed the practice of the churches in this caſe, was one *Auxentius* an *Arrian*, with his adherents, who died about 380. yeers after Chriſt, as Mr. *Philpot* the martyr of Jeſus, noteth in an Epiſtle of his, written out of priſon, to a fellow-priſoner of his, about the point; ſo Mr. *Fox* relateth in his Book of Martyrs, *ad an.* 1555. *Bullinger* after affirmeth the ſame. *Tom.*3. *ſerm.*8. *decad. quint.* After him, the *Pelagians* and *Donatiſts* oppoſed it, againſt whom *Auguſtin*, beſides others, wrote and defended it. The *Pelagians* denied it upon this ground, that Infants had no originall ſin: And in *Bernards* time, one *Peter Abilaird.* amongſt many other groſſe opinions, wherein he ſaith, he was *magis Arrius quam Arrius*, held this alſo, that Infants were not to be baptized, *Epiſt.* 190, &c. And it is not unworthy conſideration, that in the ſeverall ages, wherein this practice was gain-ſaid, it was by ſuch, who in other things were groſly erroneous, as moſt *Anabaptiſts* at this day.

And thus far of my grounds for baptizing Infants; I next come to ſpeak of a few things to the manner of baptizing; whether it ought to be with dipping, and may not be with ſprinkling only.

That dipping hath been in uſe in ſome ages and places, is out of queſtion, and dipping thrice alſo, ſtories relate: but that it was inſtituted, and ſo belong to the eſſentials of baptiſme, I am not convinced: For, as I would have no man to yeeld to humane apprehenſions with-

without Gods Word; ſo, unleſſe it can be proved from Scriptures, I deſire I may have the ſame leave I give others, to reſerve my faith for divine authority, to captivate my faith hereto. I obſerve theſe things preſſed:

First the word βαπτίζω, which they ſay, ſignifies to dip, and therefore to baptize, is to dip, and not to ſprinkle; many places are brought to this purpoſe, wherein the word is ſo tranſlated, and muſt be ſo taken.

To which I anſwer: The word I grant is ſo tranſlated, and muſt be ſo taken in ſome place; but it is not alwayes ſo tranſlated, nor can be ſo taken: as *Heb.* 9. 10. with divers baptiſmes; ſome of theſe were with ſprinkling, *Heb.* 9. 13. compared with *Numb.* 19. 11. 17, &c. 1 *Cor.* 10. 2. They were baptized into *Moſes* in the cloud, and in the ſea, it is not, they were dived and dipped into them, *Mar.* 1. 8. *I baptize you with water, but hee ſhall baptize you with the holy Ghoſt, and with fire*; now, this was not to be dipped with the holy Ghoſt, and with fire, but ſprinkled, as was fore-told. And why may it not be tranſlated, I ſprinkle you with water, as well as it muſt be ſprinkled with the holy Ghoſt powred on you. Again, *Acts* 1. 5. & 10. 16. in the laſt places of both clauſes, it muſt be underſtood ſprinkling, not dipping; and why may it not be taken for ſprinkled in the two former? Howſoever, the word is not alwayes to be tranſlated dipped, appears by theſe places, but may and muſt be tranſlated ſprinkled; and ſo the force of the word doth not inforce my beliefe, that a man muſt dip, or elſe he doth not baptize.

Secondly, they urge conſent to dipping, from *Johns* practice baptizing in *Ænon*, becauſe there was many waters that he might dip them; from *Philips* baptizing the Eunuch, and others alſo, who they conclude baptized with dipping: To theſe I anſwer,

First, the word will not neceſſarily inforce it, That they were baptized is our of-queſtion, but whether by dipping or ſprinkling, is queſtionable; for the word may ſignifie either, as I have ſhewed, and the Text doth not determine which, by any other expreſſion: For, as for that of many waters being there, ſome ſay that it is not meant of a great deep River, but of many rivers, (*Piſcator*) and the reaſon of his chooſing that place, may be, beauſe other places might not ſo well continue; and many other reaſons there may be, and yet this none, that hee might dip them, for that might as well have been done in other places: and it is ſaid, that was the

reaſon,

reaſon without proofe, which may be as eaſily denied as it is affirmed: nor is there any ſuch neceſſity in tranſlating the Prepoſition εἰς, that it muſt needs be *into Jordan*, and ſignifie dipping over head and eares, but it may be well enough tranſlated, *to Jordan*. I think that if the Eunuch dived over head and eares, that *Philip* did not douze himſelf ſo too; yet it is ſaid equally of them both, they deſcended εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ, from the Charet *to the water*, not *into it*, & that they both came ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος, *from the water*, not *out of the water*.

Secondly, it is not probable that they dived the parties under water when they baptized them; partly, becauſe at ſome times, and in ſome places, it was adminiſtred in a houſe, and ſuddenly, when there was no thought aforehand to prepare fit inſtruments, as in *Cornelius* houſe, the Jaylor and his houſhold, *Lydia* and her family, *Acts* 10. & 16. ſo that they might have water enough to dive them in: partly, becauſe it was not eaſie for a man to take a grown man in his armes, and dive him under water: Otherwiſe I ſee not how the Miniſter ſhould baptize them, but rather they ſhould baptize themſelves, nor ſhould the adminiſtration be miniſteriall, if the baptized perſon ſhould not be paſſive in receiving it.

Thirdly, if they ſhould be wholly dipped into water, it will hazard oft ſome mens lives, by being ſtrangled under the water; and who can ſo exactly carry the action, as not to doe too much, or too little, to hold them under too long, or not long enough?

Laſtly, it is not ſeemly, nor agreeing to common, much leſſe religious modeſty, to take them and dip them naked, before others; nor can I be perſwaded, that Jeſus when he was baptized, or any other baptized by *John*, or any body elſe, ſtripped themſelves naked. If any ſhall ſay, they covered their unſeemly parts, or that it was done in their cloathes; I ſhall ſay, it is as eaſily denied, as affirmed: the Scripture gives not the leaſt hint of ſuch a thing, which I ſuppoſe it would have done, if it had been ſo; as in other caſes it tells us of *Sauls* ſtripping himſelfe among the Prophets; the executioners of *Steven* laying their garments at *Pauls* feet, &c. Eſpecially it being in ſo weighty a matter as ſhould concern all ages.

Again, if all their cloathes were on, or but ſome of them, then certainly their fleſh was not waſhed (as 1 *Pet.* 3. 21.) but their cloathes: Onely this I ſhall acknowledge, that I ſee not but dipping (*conſideratis conſiderandis*) may be lawfull, nor can I ſay, that they that uſe it, doe worſe then they that uſe it not. But that it is abſolutely neceſſary, or the omiſſion of it maketh baptiſme null.

That ſprinkling is unlawfull, Antichriſtian, of humane invention, &c. and that baptiſme for adminiſtration, is invalid, evacuateth the death of Chriſt, &c. I cannot yeeld. I have given ſome conſiderations why I think dipping not abſolutely neceſſary, I ſhall adde a few, why I think ſprinkling with water is unlawfull, and that baptiſme ſo adminiſtred, is true baptiſme. Firſt, becauſe the word βαπτίζω will yeeld it, and may be juſtly ſo tranſlated, and muſt be ſo taken in the places by me quoted before, to which I might adde more, as *Mark* 7. 4. &c.

Secondly, from the types of our ſpirituall waſhing, which were done by ſprinkling, as *Exod.* 12. the ſprinkling of the blood of the Lamb, *Exod.* 23. the ſprinkling of the Altar, Book, people, *Levit.* 16. ſprinkling the unclean by the water of the red Heifers aſhes, *Num.* 19. All which typified unto them the blood of Chriſt, and the application of it unto themſelves for their juſtification and ſanctification. If ſprinkling were then ſufficient to them for the ſame purpoſe that dipping is now urged, I ſee nothing to hinder, but that ſprinkling may doe the ſame now: for though that was commanded, yet this is not forbidden.

Thirdly, the Prophets foretelling this grace of God communicated unto us by that ordinance (and I think this ordinance it ſelfe is foreſpoken of therein) they doe ſet it forth by ſprinkling, as *Eſa.* 52. 15. *My ſervant ſhall ſprinkle many Nations.* *Eſai.* 44. 3. *Exek.* 36. 25. *I will powre clean water upon you.* From theſe Propheſies I conclude, that ſprinkling, or powring on, may be juſtified.

Fourthly, in the new Teſtament the grace of God is ſet forth by the very word ſprinkling, as *Heb.* 10. 22. *Having your hearts ſprinkled from an evill conſcience, and your bodies waſhed with pure water,* which notes baptiſme, and this waſhing, as alſo 1 *Cor.* 6. 11. may be with powring on, as the ſame word is ſo to be taken, *Acts* 16. 33. *The ſame houre hee took them,* ἔλουσεν ἀπὸ τῶν πληγῶν, *waſhed their wounds,* which was not with dipping certainly, but with powring on. So *Heb.* 12, 21. 24. *To the bloud of ſprinkling,* 1 *Pet.* 1. 2. *Elect, &c. through the ſanctification of the Spirit unto obedience, and ſprinkling of the blood of Jeſus Chriſt.* By theſe expreſſions certainly the holy Ghoſt intends to hold out the adminiſtration of the ſignes of Gods grace. So that upon theſe conſiderations, I am well perſwaded, that though dipping may be lawfull, yet ſprinkling is not unlawfull, and queſtion not but the ordinance adminiſtred by ſprinkling, is as valid, as the adminiſtring of it by dipping. And if they do not

forget

forget themſelves, that condemn ſprinkling as Antichriſtian, humane, &c. they doe and will grant, that in ſome caſes it may be lawfull, and then it is lawfull in it ſelfe morally, or certainly, no caſe can make it morally lawfull, but it is a ſin ſo to doe in what caſe ſoever: I argue therefore from thence, thus:

Fifthly, if ſprinkling in ſome caſe be lawful, then it is not morally unlawfull in it ſelf at all. But in ſome caſes ſprinkling may be lawfull (as where there is but little water.) *Ergo*, it is not morally unlawful in it ſelf.

Sixthly, I ſhall adde here the judgement of *Chamier*, *Tom.* 4. *lib.* 5. *cap.* 2. *ſect.* 6. & the rather becauſe he is quoted by one as affirming, *Tom.* 1. *p.* 347. that immerſion was changed into aſperſion after the time of *Gregory* 1. which was about 500. years after Chriſt, which if he did, then it is cleare he altered his judgement afterward: for thus in the place quoted by me, he writeth, *Incertum quando immerſio mutata fuit in aſperſionem, aut unde facto initio, &c.* It is uncertain when dipping was changed into ſprinkling, or whence it had beginning, unleſſe it may ſeeme that 3000. could not be baptized of a few Apoſtles, and that in our dayes if every one ſhould be dipped; nor was there ſufficient water to douze the Jaylor in the priſon, if hee was baptized by dipping; uſe ſheweth ſprinkling to be more meet, both in regard of the incommodiouſneſſe of the ſeaſon, as alſo in reſpect of modeſty: for which cauſe it is manifeſt that Deaconeſſes were imployed in undreſſing of women; nor is the nature of the ſacrament thereby altered: for ſeeing all the force of water is in ſignification by waſhing, certainly it is not much to purpoſe how much one is waſhed: as in the Supper of the Lord, how much one eateth or drinketh; for the waſhing of one part is of the ſame nature with waſhing the whole. Thus farre he: Nor doth the ſprinkling of a few drops of water, more tend to evacuate Chriſts death, or to nouriſh this dangerous errour, that any ſhould bee hereby occaſioned to think that a few drops of Chriſts blood ſhed for his people, is ſufficient to waſh away their ſins, then the eating of a bit of bread, and drinking a few drops of wine doth evacuate his death, and tend to nouriſh the ſame errour; and what river may not in this conſideration be excepted againſt, or what quantity muſt it bee limited unto? Thus I have run out my thoughts concerning this rite of adminiſtring baptiſme, I come in the next place to conſider the adminiſtration of baptiſme in *England*, and the authority by which baptiſme was there adminiſtred. And I beleeve it is neceſſary to be reſolved, that was done by a lawfull power, and juſt authority: For though an officer of State doe a thing by vertue of his office, and according to law

maketh the thing authenticall and of force civilly; yet it will not follow, that if any private man not in office, ſhall doe the ſame thing in the ſame form of words, and every way elſe without any difference, that ſuch an act is legall, and will be allowed; but rather it will expoſe the doer, and for whom ſuch a thing is done, to danger of juſt penalty: So in this caſe, and therefore if the authority by which baptiſme was there adminiſtred, be not lawfull and of God, I confeſſe I cannot ſee how the thing it ſelfe can be in force and juſtifiable. I adde, that all Antichriſtian power, and adminiſtrations by it, as Antichriſtian, cannot be lawfull. And being it ſelfe an Idoll and humane invention, it cannot give being to an ordinance, or adde any thing to it, but corrupt it, and make it rather worſe then better. The ordination of a Pope, or Prelate, the preſentation of a Patron, &c. give not the Miniſter a calling, nor are neceſſary at all to make a man a Miniſter, they corrupt the calling and the purity of it, but the eſſentiall of a calling is from ſome other power, which is neceſſarily required to make the practiſe good and authenticall. If *Johns* baptiſme was of men, certainly it was unlawfull; but if of God, ſo it was lawfull, and ſo I ſay of ours. To cleare my ſelfe here, I ſhall premiſe theſe things, and ſo come to the concluſion.

Firſt, a calling may be lawfull, and of God, and yet corrupted many wayes; as firſt, by unfitneſſe of perſons in regard of their qualifications: for the Phariſees ſate in *Moſes* chaire, *Matth.* 23. *Malac.* 2. 8. Secondly, by the manner of entrance into the calling: ſo the high Prieſthood adminiſtred by them who took upon them the Kingly dignity, many of them alſo purchaſing the Prieſthood by mony given to the heathen Kings, who often put out one, and put in another, and whereas the high Prieſt was to continue during his life; yet *Caiaphas* was high Prieſt but a yeare. Thirdly, by their ungodly and wicked acts in it, as *Elies* ſonnes, *Aaron* yeelded to the people to make a Calfe, and kept a feſtivall day; yet did not theſe things nullifie the calling of the Prieſthood, nor did their adminiſtrations prove null thereby, and invalid. In the new Teſtament, the church of *Thyatira* had corrupted the Miniſteriall calling groſly, in ſuffering a woman under colour of a Propheteſſe, to teach, yet did not this deſtroy the calling of Miniſtry in that Church, but that the calling of Miniſtry in that Church was lawfull.

Secondly, a Church becomes a Church, or a company of men and women become a Church, not by uſurping the things of God of themſelves, nor by imitating others in their Church practices, as the

Edomites,

Edomites, *Ishmaelites*, &c. or *Manasseh*, the son in law of *Sanballat*, who builded a Temple in mount *Gerizim*, after the fashion of that in *Jerusalem*, or *Onias*, building one in *Egypt*, and in both of them setting up such services as were in *Jerusalem*) but by Gods dispensation, and that performed by these two acts: First, on Gods part, sending the word of his grace, offering it unto a people, thereby opening their eyes, and turning them from darkness to light, and taketh hold of them by some effect of his power; so that he turns them from Idols to God: Secondly, from that act he produceth another, by that effect of his power, whereby such people takes hold on Gods offer, and taking him and his Christ to be theirs, and submitting themselves unto Christ, as their Lord and King, yeeld themselves up together in joynt and publike visible profession, according to his lawes and ordinances.

Thirdly, such a church thus constituted is a true church, and a reall Ecclesiasticall body, polity or corporation in it self, and so many companies as thus joyn together, are so many churches of equall power, rights, priviledges, and jurisdictions; nor is any one a mother church unto others, but all are sister churches: and though civilly the people may be distinguished into many commonwealths, and many may be subject unto one, yet the severall churches of every subordinate commonwealth are not hereby subject unto the church of the commonwealth, to which the rest are subordinate, but they remain entirely equall among themselves, and all equally subordinate unto Jesus Christ.

Fourthly, such a church or churches, so remain still true churches, so long as God continues his dispensation towards them, and no longer: but when God forsakes them, and gives them a bill of divorce, then they leave off to be a church, and not before; nor is it in the power of any other church or churches, to unchurch any one such church, but Christ himself must do that. This church, or these churches, notwithstanding, may much degenerate, and be defiled, in their doctrine and government, desperately corrupted with error and sinfull practices (as the *Jews* before Christ commonly, and most of all in Christs dayes; after Christ, the churches of *Corinth*, *Galatia*, the churches of *Asia*, *Rev.* 2. and 3. &c.) yet, till Christ remove the candlestick, and come himself, and unchurch them, they still abide churches of Christ, and are so to be acknowledged of all.

Fifthly, such as the state of the church is, such is the state of the Ministry of that church and administration, and so long as the true church remains a true church, so long the ministry remains a true ministry,

niſtry, and all the divine inſtitutions, authenticall adminiſtrations, and truly the Lords ordinances, notwithſtandiag the mixture of humane devices with them, making the commandments of God of none effect, through their traditions. To cleer all theſe in each particular by the light of divine revelation, would require a larger diſcourſe then I intend, and not ſo difficult as tedious. I doubt not, but any truly judicious, conſidering the ſtate of churches in the old and new Teſtament, will yeeld without any other travell, what is here ſet down, and that the church, miniſtry, and adminſtrations, ſtand and fall together.

To come then to the queſtion, I affirm; that if there be true churches in *England*, then there is a lawfull miniſtry there, and true authenticall adminiſtrations. But there are true churches there; *Ergo*, there is a lawfull miniſtry there, and authenticall adminiſtration. The Conſequent is cleer, becauſe it is the true being of a church that giveth being to the truth of miniſtry and ordinances, and not the ordinances that give being to a church. Let any company ſet up preaching, and adminiſter the Sacraments, (I ſo call them for diſcourſe ſake) that will not make that company to be a church, but becauſe they are not a church, therefore they are not Gods ordinances. The antecedent, that there are true churches in *England*, I prove thus: If the true viſible ſtate of Chriſts Church be to abide from his time unto the end of the world (as it muſt, *Dan.* 7. *Luke* 1. 33. *Mat.* 16. 16. & 18. 18. 20. & 28. 19, 20. 1 *Cor.* 11. *Heb.* 12. 29, *&c.*) then it is in *England*, and places of like conſideration, that it hath continued in ſome other places of the world. But it hath not continued in any other places of the world, (it will be gratefull to all that deſire truth, if any man can ſhew where) alſo in *England*, and places of like conſideration hath Chriſts viſible church continued: Again, if there be no other churches in the world, nor have bin for many hundred yeers, but thoſe that are infected with Papiſme, (that is the dominion of the Pope and traditional doctrine) or reformed churches, and *England* amongſt others, then either the churches infected with Papiſme are the true viſible churches of Chriſt, or the reformed. But there are no other churches in the world, nor have been for many hundred yeers, but thoſe that are infected with Papiſme, or the reformed; *Ergo*, the one or the other, muſt be the true viſible churches of Chriſt. But notwithſtanding thoſe that are infected with Papiſme, few grant it, as now they ſtand; *Ergo*, the reformed, and *England* amongſt others. Further, if *Antichriſt* muſt ſit in the Temple of God, 2 *Theſ.* 2. 4. and the courts of the Temple be given unto the Antichriſtian *Gentiles* for a certain time, *Rev.* 11. 1. to 15. to tread under foot, then there was a true church-

church-eſtate where he ſate, and whileſt he ſate there, and the true meaſured Temple, whoſe courts he treads under foot; nor can there be *Antichriſt*, unleſſe there be the Temple and courts thereof where he is. And if *Antichriſt* ever ſate in *England*, then there was the Temple of God there before he ſate in it; and whileſt he ſate in it, as alſo in other reformed churches. The Temple or church is the ſubject wherein hee muſt ſit. The *Antichriſtian* ſeat is not the ſubject nor conſtitutes it, but is an accident, vitiating the ſubject, the removing thereof *Antichriſtianity* doth not deſtroy the ſubject, or make it ceaſe to be, but changeth it into a better ſtate. I ſhall adde this: If ever there were true churches conſtituted in *England*, then they remain ſo ſtill, or God hath by ſome manifeſt act unchurched them; unleſſe therefore they that deny true miniſtry in *England*, and baptiſme there, can, and do prove, that churches were never conſtituted there, or make good ſome manifeſt act of God unchurching them, ſutable to ſuch acts of his in Scriptures in the like caſes, and whereby wee may cleerly diſcern the like effects, all that can be ſaid to diſprove the lawfulneſſe of miniſtry there, or to prove the unlawfulneſſe of adminiſtrations there, ſo far as they are preſcribed in the word, will not be available. And yet I ſhall be content to ſpeak a little farther of the church-eſtate and miniſtry in *England*. And concerning churches, it is to be conſidered, that a company become or are a church, either by converſion and initiall conſtitution, or by continuance of the ſame conſtituted churches ſucceſſively by propagation of members, who all are born in the church-ſtate, and under the covenant of God, and belong unto the church, and are a church ſucceſſively, ſo long as God ſhall continue his begun diſpenſation, even as well, and as fully as the firſt; and though in reſpect of the numericall members, they are not the ſame; yet truly they are the ſame in kinde, *Rom.* 11. 16. 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. *Gal.* 2. 15. even as man continues the ſame in kind from the firſt man, though not the ſame in number; ſo the church-eſtate continued from *Adams* time till *Abrahams* in the world by ſucceſſion of generations: So the *Jewes* continued a church from *Abrahams* time till Chriſts.

Secondly, the way to prove churches to have had true conſtitution, is no way to be attained, but either by Scriptures, or humane teſtimony: By Scriptures, we may take notice of many churches planted in *Judea*, *Syria*, *Galatia*, *Achaia*, *Macedonia*, &c. and by name, *Rome*, *Corinth*, *Cenchrea*, *Philip.*: *Coloſſ.* *Theſſal.* *Epheſ.* *Smyrna*, &c. of any other by name I know not. That the Apoſtle preached from *Jeruſalem* to *Illyricum*, and that hee mentions his coming into *Italy* by *Spain*, is evident, but whether

whether any churches were planted there or no, divine records manifeſt not: And as cleer it is, that thoſe churches mentioned in Scriptures are deſtroyed; nor can wee by Scriptures prove the continuance of Chriſts viſible Kingdome in the world for many hundred yeeres upward, but in *Rome*, which few will plead for, to have any truth of church-eſtate; and I ſee no need of proving any ſuch thing in this caſe. So that by Scripture teſtimony, I know not where we may caſt our eys, to look upon any Church now, or for many yeers paſt, exiſtent: By humane teſtimony, we may take notice of the Goſpel, preached in many places, and amongſt other, in *Britain*, by Apoſtolicall authority, where the Word hath ever continued ſince, more or leſſe, and therefore it is falſe for *Rome* to challenge the converſion of the *Engliſh* nation, and no leſſe abſurd and injurious for us to draw and derive our ſucceſſion from them: As the Goſpel was received there, ſo it hath not been without fruit, as alſo in other places; but under the tyrannie of Ethnick Emperors, and apoſtaſie of Antichriſtian Biſhops, many there have witneſſed unto the truth of Chriſt, and ſuffered for the teſtimony of Jeſus; nor hath it been at any time, nor is now ineffectuall there, but the Lord hath been pleaſed to bleſſe thoſe means of his, notwithſtanding perſecution or corruptions, with converſion of many thouſand ſoules from Satan to himſelf; yea, hee hath not only reſerved ſucceſſively even in *England* unto himſelf thouſands that have not bowed their knees unto *Baal*, but amongſt others, ſome of the moſt famous lights that he vouchſafed to raiſe up in the time of that horrid darkneſſe overſpreading the world, have been of *Engliſh* Chriſtians, as Mr. *Wickliffe*, Paſtor of *Lutterworth*, (though corruptly called in part) in *Lincolnſhire*. It cannot be denyed, that as in all other places of the Weſtern world whereſoever Chriſtianity ſetled, the whole world went after the Beaſt, and all churches (I know not one excepted) with that apoſtaſie were corrupted, and the courts of the Temple were not meaſured, and the holy city was given to be troden under foot of the *Gentiles* Antichriſtian 42. moneths; yet all this time the holy city remains a holy city, and after too, unleſſe God himſelf rejecteth her. In the ſame condition amongſt others, were the churches in *England* corrupted as the reſt, with falſe doctrine, Idolatry, &c. and uſurped upon by *Antichriſt*, againſt which, God even there alſo had his two witneſſes, ſome few propheſying in ſackcloth. At laſt it pleaſed God more fully to cleer up the light, and cauſed his truth to prevail; ſo as many thouſands were redeemed from amongſt men Antichriſtian, and they were the firſt fruits unto God and the Lamb; nor was the church-

eſtate

eſtate altered eſſentially all this time, nor are theſe firſt fruites unto God, new conſtituted churches, but members of ſome churches, cleering themſelves from corruption, and by reformation recovering themſelves out of a deſperate diſeaſed condition, into a more healthfull and ſound eſtate. In which courſe the Lord went on mightily in many places, eſpecially after *Luthers* time, yea, even in *England*; ſomething by *Henry* the 8th, more by *Edward* the 6th. and Queen *Elizabeth*, who did not conſtitute new churches, but reformed the churches, (as *Geneva*, *Scotland*, &c. in a further degree) deeply degenerated from the firſt conſtitution, and the pure ſtate thereof; as they did the like in the ſtate of *Judah* often, ſometimes better and more fully, and ſometimes not ſo fully in the dayes of *Judges*, *David*, *Aſa*, *Jehoſaphat*, *Hezekiah*, *Joſiah*, *Ezra* and *Nehemiah*.

To conclude this, as I believe firmly Chriſts viſible Church hath continued in the world from his time to this day, though not alwayes in one eſtate, nor ever in like purity: So I know not how it may be better cleared in the generall, or any thing more be ſaid for any other church or churches, then I have here ſet down, for the continuance of the viſible church-eſtate in *England* in particular; if any can, I think they ſhall do well, and that which is neceſſary, eſpecially in theſe times; and therefore, as I ſaid afore, unleſſe they that deny true miniſtry in *England* can ſhew that there never was church-eſtate in *England*, nor conſtituted churches; or that God hath given them a bill of divorce, I ſhall deſire all that will not be ſatisfied herewith, that they will be content not to diſquiet themſelves with diſturbance to others.

I come now to propound ſome things about the miniſtry there in particular. To this purpoſe, wee know all, that no man can have a lawfull Calling but of God, and that in one of theſe two wayes: Immediately by himſelf, without concurrence of man: or mediately by men, uſing them as inſtruments, other way of calling I know not any according to the Word; accounting all callings, or way of calling not ſet down in the Word to be humane and Idolatrous.

Concerning the way of calling by men (for of the other I know not any, but the Apoſtles, that ever were, or are to be called) two things I deſire to ſpeak to:

Firſt, who hath the power of applying a calling to a man.

Secondly, how it is applyed.

1. Who hath the power of applying a miniſteriall calling to a man? ſome ſay the Pope, ſome ſtand for immediate revelation, both which

I conceive to be alike contrary to the Word; ſome ſay the Chriſtian Magiſtrate, *quà* Magiſtrate, at leaſt approbation; but I ſee no warrant for this neither; ſome ſay the Church, but by Chuch they underſtand a Presbyterie or Claſſis (a company of Presbyters of ſeverall churches) or Councell, but of theſe wee have no cleer evidence in Scriptures to evince ſuch a church, or ſuch a practice: For, though there be mention of laying on of the hands of Presbyters, yet that was not the actuall calling of a man, but a ceremony of confirmation, as I ſhall ſhew afterward.

By church therefore, I judge is meant a company of Saints, joyned together in profeſſion, and ſucceſſively, ſtanding up in the ſame eſtate, and this company hath power to apply the office to ſuch a man as may be according to Gods Word: Thus I judge, partly from Scriptures, partly from reaſon; the Scriptures are theſe, in the old Teſtament the *Jewes* choſe their own officers: *Deut.* 1. 13. & 16. 18. In the new Teſtament, *Act.* 1. 26. The word ſignifies, hee was incorporated into the ſocietie of the eleven, by common ſuffrages.

In the context I note two things:

Firſt, the whole company did chooſe two from out of themſelves, and ſet them before the Lord, becauſe the applying of that kinde of calling depended only on God; yet they bring it thus far, as to ſingle out two.

Secondly, God having choſen one of the two, they ſubſcribe to it by joynt ſuffrages; nor did any other thing concur in that mans calling, no impoſition of hands, which if it had been neceſſary, certainly ſhould have been, eſpecially there being eleven Apoſtles preſent; and inferiour perſons, in a caſe impoſed hands on *Paul* and *Barnabas*, *Acts* 13. Again, *Acts* 6. 3, 5. The multitude, that is, the church, and it ſeems, without the aſſiſtance of the Apoſtles, did look out by examination and triall, and chooſe ſeven men amongſt themſelves, and then ſet them before the Apoſtles, who prayed, and laid their hands on them, *Acts* 14. 23. They ſet up Elders in every church, by lifting up of hands, that is, they aſſiſted the churches in ordaining Elders, who were choſen by peoples ſuffrages, manifeſted by their lifting up their hands; and 2 *Cor.* 8. 19. he whoſe praiſe is in the Goſpel was choſen by the churches, teſtifying their ſuffrages, by lifting up their hands; from which Scriptures I judge, that the power of chooſing and ſetting apart a perſon for church-office, is in the church it ſelf. Hereunto I adde theſe reaſons:

Firſt, that which concerns all the church, it is reaſon it ſhould be done

done by all the church; but to have this or that man an officer, to adminiſter, concernes all the church; *Ergo*, it is reaſon it ſhould be done by the church, to chooſe him to office.

Secondly, no adjunct in order of nature, is before the ſubject, nor is capable of receiving any thing, but as it adheres to, and ſo from the ſubject; but miniſtry is the adjunct of the church, and the church is the ſubject; *Ergo*, the miniſtery is not capable of any power, but as it adheres to the church, and ſo from it; as the eye in the body, *&c.*

Thirdly, the Church is the Spouſe of Chriſt and his body, but a Presbyterie is not the Spouſe, not the body, but a part of the Spouſe, or body, *Rom.* 12. 1 *Cor.* 12. *Ergo*, the power is in the church primarily, and not in the Presbyterie, elſe the head ſhould not derive power to the body at all; and though the Presbyters, *qua* Believers, are a part of the body of Chriſt with the reſt, that make up the whole; yet as Presbyters they are parts of Chriſt, and not of the church: the mouth and eyes of Chriſt, and not of the church; ſo they and the church, as believers, have no power, but they derive it immediately from Chriſt; which I cannot ſee how it may be made good.

Fourthly, if the church hath power to refuſe a man, and to put him out, then ſhee hath power to chooſe and put him in; but the firſt is true, elſe ſhee ſins not in ſuffering falſe teachers; nor can ſhee decline a vitious Elder, or ſhut her ſelf of him, *invito vel non curante presbyterio.*

Fifthly, there is no power that any can have from heaven ordinarily, but by ſome tranſaction between God and them; but there is no ſuch tranſaction between God and the Presbyterie primarily, the covenant is not made with them, but with the church, *Rom.* 9. v. 4. *Epheſ.* 2. 12, 13. 19. 20. *Ergo*, the power is hers primarily, and as the firſt ſubject of it from Chriſt.

Sixthly, if the church and not the Presbyterie be the kingly nation, royall prieſthood, and Kings and Prieſts unto God, then the power belongs to the church, and not to the Presbyterie; but the church is the kingly nation, *&c.* and not the Presbyterie; *Ergo*, the power belongs to the church, and not to the Presbyterie. The Antecedent is true, *Exod.* 19. 1 *Pet.* 2. 5. *Rev.* 7. 6. and that as a church. The Conſequent is evident: Becauſe, *&c.* they ſhould be titular things only, and have a naked name only, without power; and they that are not Kings and Prieſts, *&c.* as the Presbyterie, *qua tales*, they ſhould have the power.

Laſt of all, if the words, *Go tell the Church*, be meant not of the

presbyterie only, but of the church of Saints, the whole body consisting of flock and Elders, then the power belongs not to the Presbyterie, but to the whole: But the words, *Go tell the church*, are not meant of a Presbyterie, but of the whole, consisting of flock and Elders; *Ergo*, the power belongs to the church, as *totum*, and not to the Presbyterie, distinguished from the church. All this is manifest from the use of the word church, which in the new Testament is no where used for the Presbyterie alone, but sometimes for the members alone without, or distinct from Presbyterie: as *Acts* 14. 23. and 15. 4. 22. 1 *Cor.* 12. 28. frequently for the whole flock and Elders together. Some, I confesse, alledge those places: *Acts* 14. 27. and 18. 22. to prove the word church to mean Presbyterie, and the reason they give is this: That it is not probable that the Apostle there saluted all the church, or gathered all the church together, but rather the Presbyterie: But there is no force in this reason; for it is like, will I say, that he gathered the whole church, and saluted the whole church, and might do it well enough without any inconvenience; yea, and the Text saith, he did, and therefore it is more then likely, even a most certain truth. The places therefore will not prove that the word church doth mean Presbyterie, nor argue, that *Go tell the church*, is tell the Presbyterie.

Junius, &c.

Secondly, from the relation of the party offending, which is to the church, and not to the Presbyterie; for their fellowship is with the church as church, the covenant and brotherhood is with them; and therefore, though the Presbyterie orderly exerciseth the power; yet it is *in ordine ad Ecclesiam*; there is no particular relation between the party and Presbyterie, as may advantage the Presbyterie to exercise such an act of power over the party, no more then they may administer the Sacraments to a private person, but to him as a church member, and with the whole church.

Thirdly, the Presbyterie consisting of three or four Elders, are offended by a brother, bound up in fellowship with an hundred private brethren; now the Presbyterie admonishing, they can go no further, if they be the church, and the brother not hearing the Presbyterie, is to be accounted as a Publican and Heathen, though not one of the hundred know of it; and so if a private brother offend, and bring it to the Prebytery.

Fourthly, the Presbytery may be the party offending, and then you must tell the Church that the Church offendeth, that is, go tell themselves. If you say, I may tell the Classis; I answer, Take for granted, there

there is ſuch an ordinance, yet I will ſuppoſe they may take in with the offending Presbytery, and I muſt ſtay at a generall Councell, if it may be had, which is not free from errour neither. And I ſhall as willingly ſtay at a Church of Saints, unleſſe I ſee more convincing grounds to enforce the inſtitution of them, as divine appointments. And if a Church offend, there is another courſe to be taken; this rule will not reach here.

Fifthly, if by *Goe tell the Church*, bee meant the Presbytery, then there being but two or three of the Presbytery, a brother offended cannot take one or two of them for witneſſes, becauſe then he ſhould tell the Church before the turn come, and could make no further proceeding. But a brother offended may take one or two Presbyters for witneſſes. *Ergo*, Presbytery cannot be the Church. And if it cannot be taken for a Presbytery, much leſſe for a Claſſis, Synod, Councell: Nor doe I obſerve any of Chriſts Apoſtles in any directions given by them to *Timothy*, *Titus*, or any Churches or people, or Chriſt himſelfe in his Epiſtles to the ſeven Churches of Aſia, ſpeak one word of going to a Claſſis, or Provinciall Synod and Church, and which certainly they would have done, if there had been ſuch an inſtitution.

Again, Chriſt would have blamed the Claſſis, or Presbyteriall Church, and not every particular Angel, and the particular church to which he belonged. And I verily think hee would have ſpoken ſome word of Councell in one or other, that they ſhould have gathered a Synod, or ſome of each Churches Presbyteries at leaſt, to have met about it, and to have taken ſome courſe to rectifie things, if hee knew there were, or ought to be ſuch a conſtitution or ordinance binding all ages. And he had left them without advice in ſeeking ſome help without their own limits and bounds, within which he terminates all his inſtructions and counſels; upon theſe conſiderations I conceive it is not a well grounded apprehenſion, nor to be made good by force of argument, that every one of theſe ſeven Churches were Claſſicall or Synodall churches, that is, many churches in a conſociation; and the Angel in each to mean a company of Presbyters belonging to all thoſe churches, as the particular Elders of each, but here attended as a Claſſis, or collection of all the Presbyters of each church, and that the ſeven Angels ſhould be ſeven Claſſes, or Synodall, Presbyteriall aſſemblies; notwithſtanding I conceive there may bee good and neceſſary uſe of ſuch aſſemblies in a way of prudence, and brotherly helpfulneſſe. Thus of the power of applying, to whom it belongeth; a little now of the way of applying of this calling to a man, which is done

by

by theſe particular acts: Firſt, by triall conſiſting in a right underſtanding of Chriſts rule, and applying it to ſuch a man, as they ſhall diſcern the rule to fit to: and herein though the help of Presbyters, as better gifted, be eſpecially uſefull, yet not excluding the people, as if their part in triall were nothing, whereas they muſt try all things, 1 *Theſſ.* 5. the ſpirits, 1 *John* 4. are able to diſcerne the voyce of Chriſt from a ſtranger, *Joh.* 10. and prove the verity of *Pauls* teaching by the Scriptures, *Acts* 17.2[1]y the party thus tried, is propounded and preſented to the church, or multitude, who by their ſuffrages do conſent to chuſe and ſet apart that man for that office. And that this belongeth to the people, none that I know will deny. And upon the peoples manifeſtation of themſelves, if he ſhall accept it, and yeeld himſelf up for that office to which they have ſet him apart, I count this the chiefe part, and moſt eſſentiall of a Miniſteriall calling, and true, though there ſhould be no more.

Thirdly, ordination, by impoſition of hands upon the head of the elect party, which was practiſed ſometimes by the Apoſtles, *Acts* 6. and by the Presbytery in *Timothies* calling, 1 *Tim.* 4. Yet to cleare this a little further, two things may be cleared: Firſt, of the neceſſitie of this ceremony, which ſome hold muſt be, or elſe no calling, and that it alone giveth the eſſence of calling to a man. But I doe not think it is ſo neceſſary, or of ſuch conſequence; firſt, becauſe it was not uſed by Chriſt in ordaining his Apoſtles, nor inſtituted by him for ordaining others. That Chriſt impoſed his hands upon many infirm, and commanded his Apoſtles to lay their hands upon the ſick for their recovery, is cleare, *Matth.* 9. *Mark* 5. 6, 7, 8, 16. *Luke* 4. 13. but we never read that Chriſt commanded impoſition of hands to ordain an officer. In this caſe we read that it was alſo ſometimes uſed, *Acts* 6. & 1 *Tim.* 4. and not any where elſe that I know of: for *Acts* 13. is of a diverſe conſideration. There are but two places therefore that ſpeake to this caſe, neither of which proves an inſtitution; they laid their hands upon many ſick, and upon others, to conferre the holy Ghoſt; but theſe prove no inſtitution in theſe things. Our Saviour breathed upon the Apoſtles, and they received the holy Ghoſt, but he made not that an inſtitution. Secondly, Divines judge it a thing indifferent, and therefore not eſſentiall, as *Polanus*, *Tilenus*, that the act of triall and chuſing is much greater then the laying on of hands. *Calvin. Inſtit. lib. cap.* 3. *ſect.* 16. yet I count it a comely and convenient rite, and not to be neglected where it may be had in Gods way; nor doe they that hold it neceſſary, ſo maintain it, but that in ſome caſes it may bee wanting, and yet the calling lawfull, which I judge diſputable.

1 Tim. 5.

A

A ſecond queſtion is, to whom it belongeth to impoſe hands? I anſwer, to a Presbytery if it may be had: but that the want of it maketh the calling invalid, I ſee nothing to conclude: for then no calling to the Miniſtry can be cleared from that time that one being choſen out of the reſt of the Presbytery, and called peculiarly *Epiſcopus*, and performing this action alone, afterward uſurped by the Hierarchy; but all theſe Miniſtries muſt be null, and there ſhould be no true Miniſtry in the world: and how can now any at this day have power legitimate to doe this firſt, and being done by ſuch as were no Presbyters, or Antichriſtian Idols, how can the act and acts of any following Presbytery be comfortably cleared? In a word, I think that as in the preſentment of the Levits at firſt to the Lord, *Numb.* 8. 9, 10. all the Congregation was gathered together and laid their hands on the Levits: it was the act of the whole company, yet performed for them, and in their ſtead by ſome of them, not the Elders, (they were too few) but by the firſt born, in whoſe ſtead they were given up to God: So it may bee now in the like caſe, there being no Presbytery, the people chuſing one for Office, according to rule, this rite may be at firſt performed by ſome chief in ſtead of the reſt. And if it be not practiſed at the firſt, I ſee no ſuch danger, the reſt concurring. As in their return from *Babylon* after the 70 yeares captivity, things were not ſo exact as at firſt inſtitution; yea, five ſpeciall things were alwayes wanting from that time in the ſecond Temple, that had been in the firſt. But I cannot prove, may ſome ſay, all theſe, nor the firſt two, which I hold to be of the eſſence of Miniſteriall calling, in reference to the Miniſtry in *England?* I anſwer, Firſt, things are done either explicitly and in expreſſe termes, or implicitly and by a tacite and virtuall conſent. Secondly, every company meeting in one place for worſhip ſucceſſively from the firſt conſtitution, remained a true Church, though much corrupted; and ſtill ſo much purer as they did or doe reform themſelves in their ſtanding and worſhip according to the word of Chriſt. Thirdly, the calling of Miniſtry in each church, though greatly corrupted, is eſſentially a true calling, as the church is eſſentially a true church, conſiſting of Saints fœderally, though they be not ſuch Saints as they ſhould bee. Fourthly, the maner of calling is not the Biſhops ordination, &c. that makes it not a calling, but marres the goodneſſe of it, addes nothing unto it, but derogates from the purity of it. But the people receiving a man, ſent unto them in a corrupt way, and joyning with him to worſhip God, though here alſo with much corruption; and not exerciſing their power in refuſing him (though they doe not explicitly exerciſe

exercise their power in chusing) they do implicitly chuse him. I say, by these three acts of receiving, joyning with, and not refusing, they doe virtually and really give him all the just calling that he hath, which is a true Ministeriall calling, and so all the ordinances, administred by him there, which God hath prescribed (as baptisme amongst others, notwithstanding humane additions corrupting the purity of any of them) are really Gods ordinances, and of divine authority, and validity. As of old, *Jer.* 5.30,31. *There is a horrible thing committed in the Land, the Prophets propheſie falſhoods, the Prieſts beare rule by their means, and my people love to have it ſo*: Yet this did not make them no Church, or take away the lawfulneſſe of Ministry, or nullifie their just administrations; so in this case I judge the same, and therewith conclude this Discourse.

FINIS.